



THE PRACTICE OF ARBITRATIONS. By Professor KERR [F.].

ATREATISE* that may fairly be described as a most useful book of reference for architects, and all the more that it is neither expensive to purchase nor bulky to handle, has just come into the Library. This seems, moreover, to be the only treatise of the kind that may claim to be specially—and so far exclusively—devoted to the consideration of the professional architect's (and engineer's) legal position; and it is one of its particular merits that, while professing to lay down the law for lawyers, and to do so on the basis of the most recently settled cases, its language is understandable by the building world as well. In this way the information supplied to the architect is set forth on the following plan:—his professional engagement, and remuneration, and the duty he undertakes; the authority he has to exercise, and the liability he incurs; the performance, or non-performance, of his builders' contracts, with the incidents of certificates and penalties; the various questions that may relate to easements and party-structures; and finally "a Chapter on Arbitrations."

It may be convenient in the present Paper to consider only the very important subject which stands last in the list—namely, the practice of building arbitrations; indeed, to look at this as a business apart, the due recognition of which as such is suggestive of something very like the doctrine that its systematic professional administration by architects, supposing them to be properly and expressly qualified for the work as a judicial order, might go much farther than it does towards enabling the building world to dispense in a great measure with the study of those perplexities which are dealt with throughout the rest of the book. Now it happens that the public mind in England has recently been peculiarly exercised about the question of arbitration in a supremely important form—namely, the international—and many sensible people have been not a little astonished to learn that a great kindred community which professes to be one of the shrewdest in the world, and most liberal-minded, seems to have its doubts about the expediency of accepting the principle freely. The proper view to take, however, of this remarkable episode appears to be, not that settlement by violence can by any possibility be preferable as a rule, but that settlement by reference, like everything else that is human, has its own weak points; for indeed it has long been ascertained as a fact amongst men of business that the process, however admirable in intention, does not always happen to turn out well in practice. To come to the point, we find the legal profession constantly and conscientiously complaining of inherent defects in the system, and the language used by the authors of this treatise states the case clearly enough:—"It is one very serious objection to arbitrations, as generally conducted, that the expense far exceeds the cost of ordinary litigation;" and, further, "a great amount of time is wasted, because the arbitrator" (meaning, of course, more particularly any other arbitrator than a lawyer) "cannot conduct the inquiry in the same expeditious and businesslike manner as a judge in Court." In reply to this challenge it is enough on the

* *The Law relating to Civil Engineers, Architects, and Contractors; with a Chapter on Arbitrations.* By L. Livingston Macassey, Barrister-at-Law, M.Inst.C.E., and
Third Series, Vol. IV, No. 15,—17 June 1897.

J. Andrew Strahan, M.A., LL.B., Barrister-at-Law, Hon. Assoc. R.I.B.A. Second Edition. 8s. Lond. 1897. Price 12s. 6d. Messrs. Stevens & Sons, 119-20, Chancery Lane.

present occasion to say that in building references, although no doubt there is ample room for improvement, the objections quoted are by no means insurmountable when the arbitrator knows his business, and that an architect (*archi-tectus*, the chieftain of the work) of experience and good sense, sitting as arbitrator, need never be afraid of animadversion if he will insist upon a prompt exposition of the facts, and apply to them with the same promptitude those general principles of practical commonplace justice which come within the facile limits of what is called "a little law." Moreover, it must not be forgotten that when lawyers remark that architects have too little acquaintance with points of law, architects still more urgently complain that lawyers cannot but fail to understand clearly questions of practical building; and between these two conflicting claims the public verdict must certainly be that, whereas the building element is indispensable in a building reference, the legal element ought surely to be sufficiently represented in ordinary cases by expert knowledge. One other consideration which is of the utmost practical importance is this:—in expert arbitration the tribunal is personally and intelligently selected for the occasion by the direct choice of the parties interested, whereas in a Court of Law the element of what is equivalent to unintelligent chance is often much too conspicuous. Nor must we forget another practical distinction between litigation and arbitration—namely, that whereas the one process insists upon the matter of debate being restricted to narrow issues, often artificial and conventional, or even academical and esoteric, the other process enters thoroughly into all those matters of detail which, in building cases especially, are the most essential of all. It is in every way probable, therefore, that building disputes will be more and more frequently referred to the arbitration of architects, and it is a great deal to say that the book before us affords them an excellent opportunity for obtaining readily the qualifying legal knowledge.

One would scarcely like to suppose that any architect could permit himself to sit as arbitrator in ignorance of "the Arbitration Act of 1889" (which applies to England only, by the way, there being a special Act for Scotland of 1894, and Ireland lying, as usual, somewhat apart). But, as matter of fact, it is not altogether superfluous to point out that such an enactment ought obviously to be really attended to; in other words, that anything like the conducting of a reference in the old-fashioned rough-and-ready or even free-and-easy manner must be regarded now as hazardous, in the face of direct statutory law so recently established. Perhaps the case may be put thus:—that, in view of the very natural disinclination of the polished mind of a High Court of Justice to approve of the private intervention of unlearned outside adjudicators, but in recognition, nevertheless, of the irresistible preference on the part of the public for the employment of such convenient tribunals, the legislature has now been persuaded more expressly to legalise and indeed encourage them; but only under the stipulation that their practice shall conform in a reasonable degree to the substantial principles of legal practice, so that the decisions, which the Courts may be called upon to confirm, shall be arrived at in sufficient accordance with the more essential formalities of public justice. Accordingly the situation is this:—we find that before the year 1889 the law of arbitrations was so loose that it had practically to be sought for in an Act of the remote date of William the Third, with certain sections of an amending Act, itself nearly sixty years old, and portions of three more recent Acts relating to legal proceedings at large; so that it is not to be wondered at if unlearned referees had become somewhat licentious (so to call it) in their methods. It has therefore to be distinctly borne in mind by architect-referees nowadays that they have to proceed in strict accordance with a complete system of regulations laid down by statute only a very few years ago. Moreover, these rules, after all, for ordinary cases are simple enough:—arbitrators are encouraged to administer the oath freely; witnesses may be compelled to attend at a time and place appointed, and to produce documents; false testimony on oath is punishable as perjury; all evidence must be taken openly and in strict accordance with

the practice of the Courts; an award, whether more formal or less so, must be definite, comprehensive, and intelligible on all points; arbitrators must make their award within three months after beginning to act (or must formally in writing enlarge that period); an umpire must make his award within one month beyond the arbitrators' period (or must formally enlarge his own); and so on; and the costs are to be in the very free discretion—possibly sometimes a little too free—of the tribunal. In the volume before us the text of this important statute, which in itself is short although complex, is duly set forth for reference; but of course there is also a good deal of information as to its legal application and working, to which the judicious reader may devote careful attention without much trouble.

The classes of disputes which come to be referred to an architect as an arbitrator are of considerable variety. The application of the "arbitration clause" of building contracts has of late years become prominent; questions arising out of accident or misadventure, or other indirect or technical responsibility, are frequent; cases occur of structural damage, of negligence of various kinds, or of speculative liability; there are compensation cases and valuations, sanitary cases, claims for light and air or for support; cases of repair, of dilapidations, of works to party-walls, of dangerous structures, of fixtures; Building Act cases of more or less difficulty; questions of professional etiquette and charges; and others; and recent litigation has thrown a strong light on a special class of cases which have long been of common occurrence and of troublesome character, namely, the disputes which arise between the architect and the contracting builder when there is no "arbitration clause" in the contract; the architect, strange to say, then becoming the legalised and something very like absolute judge in (so to speak) his own quarrel. On the particular and obviously difficult point of law here involved, what is regarded as the leading case (an engineer's case—*Jackson v. The Barry Railway Co.*) was decided as recently as 1893, in the Court of Appeal, by Lords Justices Lindley and Bowen, but Lord Justice Smith dissenting. It is fully dealt with in the treatise under review, but the practical result for architects is broadly this:—that the builder who has agreed to do his work to the architect's satisfaction (without an arbitration clause), but now disputes the justice of some of that architect's directions, can no longer, as it seems, fall back upon the well-known contention of common sense and common law that such directions ought always to be reasonable and impartial, but finds himself a party in a legal form of dispute in which the architect is, by the agreement, himself the "arbitrator," with no appeal from his "decision"—even although such decision or award may most probably be simply a more formal reiteration of the very direction that is appealed against (as it emphatically was in the above leading case). The justification for this apparent anomaly is declared to be that the authority of an engineer or architect must be regarded as that of a man of such reliable honour, knowledge, and judgment (here we are of course much obliged for the compliment), that the contractor, in no sense unwarily, has covenanted to submit to his absolute dictation and mastery. Of course, if strictly inquired into, the doctrine as thus stated is seen to be only a convenient legal fiction; and, although it is to the signal honour of the great body of architects that we may refer without risk of contradiction to the fact that building contractors do actually place the utmost confidence in their personal integrity, it is nevertheless easy enough to imagine cases in which the architect, as the paid agent of an exacting principal, animated by the maxims so frequently quoted with approval about "doing the best he can for his client," and being perhaps exacting on his own account as well, may feel inclined to "let the contractor look after himself," when it would seem he is by law helplessly unable to do so. It therefore comes to this, that a contractor must carefully take the measure of an architect's character beforehand, or otherwise with equal care see that a properly framed arbitration clause is inserted in his contract, and, none the less, a proper arbitrator appointed or provided for. But at the same time it may still be difficult for practical men to see why the

good old rule should not remain in force—that the word “reasonable” is to be read into any condition of otherwise arbitrary approval, unless the well-known proviso of conveyancers be directly introduced, if only by way of warning, that such approval “shall not be unreasonably withheld.” In connection with this point it may not be amiss to quote the severe words of the Court of Appeal, spoken only a few weeks ago in the interesting and difficult case of *Drew-Bear & Co. v. the St. Pancras Guardians*:—“They” (the plaintiff builders) “also said that the architect delayed them in their work in two ways; by giving wrong orders with regard to the work, and by compelling them to undo that which had already been completed. But they forgot that the work was all to be done to the satisfaction of the architect, and that, however erroneously the architect might have exercised that duty, the builder could not sue the Guardians for that;” and, again, “if it was said that the builder found himself in slavery, he ought to have considered that when he entered into the contract.” The law, therefore, is strictly uncompromising, and so far it is for the builder to beware.

The curious distinction that the law makes between “Arbitration” and “Valuation” is not overlooked in this treatise. To the commonplace architectural intelligence a reference by two parties to a third to determine a disputed question of commercial value, and one to decide any other commercial difference not affecting mere value, are both alike processes of arbitrament having precisely the same nature and effect; but the law somehow finds it is not so, but that they are as different as a charge of assault, for instance, and a claim for rent. How far this distinction with such an impalpable difference might be found to affect the various kinds of building references, if the question were fairly argued out, is a point that seems to be worthy of more consideration than perhaps it has received; but, at any rate, this has been laid down, in the words of the highest authority, to be the spirit of the law—that whereas “arbitration” is “a judicial proceeding” by a person who hears evidence and pronounces judgment thereon, “valuation” is an act performed as a mystery by a person who “is merely using his own skill and knowledge”; and that, consequently, while an architect who is acting as an “arbitrator” is more or less “an officer of the Court,” amenable to the discipline of the Court, the same architect’s “finding,” as a “valuer”—presumably in respect of builder’s prices—“cannot be enforced as an award, and the valuer cannot be directed by the Court;” that is to say, apparently, so long as he avoids giving details, however shabbily, his totals cannot be disputed, or indeed inquired about, even if there should be plainly, and almost (but not quite) confessedly, a blunder in the figures. In fact, a “valuer,” as it seems, need not listen to evidence at all, but is supposed to arrive at his conclusions by some sort of occult intuition, and he may actually order the payment by either party of any sum of money he pleases to name, without explanation and without appeal, simply saying, “This is my opinion.” If this really be the law as established for transactions of valuation conducted by auctioneers and “estate surveyors,” it looks very like nothing less than a declaration that they are a hopelessly unscientific class, and we may at least take credit for its being generally the custom of architects as “building surveyors” to conduct their business of valuing in a different and more genial manner. But, whether this reading of the law be quite correct or not, it cannot be denied that certain methods which are in vogue appear to give rise to the doctrine plainly enough; and sometimes prejudicially enough—for all service of a judicial character that is not perfectly open and above-board must be in its very nature prejudicial to justice. As no less an authority than the Attorney-General recently pointed out to the House of Commons, speaking from personal experience and with a covert indignation which he evidently felt was completely wasted, there is well known to be a body of “valuers” whose business it is to “swear a thing up to-day, and swear it down to-morrow,” and amongst whom “the arbitrator in one case is witness in the next, and the witness in the one arbitrator in the other.” Now, it is only

human nature if such a state of things produces both laxity of administration and liberality of costs; and the objection to arbitrations that the expense is excessive is not to be wondered at if such a tale as the following can be true. There is some simple question, say, between landlord and tenant. Mr. A. is employed to "value" for the landlord. He goes to the place and "has a look round," taking with him a silent assistant. A few days after, this assistant, now called his "representative," appears again alone, and makes a private calculation of his own. In due time this becomes the declared "valuation" of the principal (call it No. 1), stated, however, only in gross, the detail being a profound secret of the office. Meanwhile, Mr. B., who has been employed by the other side, goes to the place and has a look round with his silent assistant, who appears again as his representative, and makes a private calculation No. 2. Mr. A. and Mr. B. then make a hasty comparison of their "valuations," and they are found to differ. An umpire, Mr. C., therefore pays a visit in his turn, and has a look round with his silent assistant, who appears again as his representative, and makes a private calculation No. 3. This, without any explanation, becomes the formal "award," to be "taken up" at a solicitor's office by either side, but only on payment of the "costs," amounting to a sum which is generally somewhat unexpected, but is irresistibly accounted for as being "awarded" by the umpire—in his "discretion"—to be paid to himself; the two others having to be paid privately, but of course on a scarcely less generous scale. No doubt all this could not have been managed with less trouble (to the valuers); and if the parties are dissatisfied, that is only an instance of human weakness. It sometimes may occur, however, to uninitiated business persons that the whole transaction might have been quite as well managed—the profane may even say a great deal better—and at a fraction of the cost, if the two valuers had in the first instance met personally on the spot and settled the matter offhand; or, if a settlement could not be so accomplished, had attended again with their umpire and discussed their difference before him without any fuss. The answer is simple and well known: "That is not the way surveyors do it." Perhaps this is the reason why lawyers advise the appointment of a single arbitrator rather than two—meaning the "umpire" at first rather than at the last. To some plain people it will also appear that it is of the very essence of an expert reference that a referee, selected on purely personal grounds, shall not delegate his duty to an unknown cheap assistant, or conceal his reasons, or evade accounting for his charges, or, in short, in any way subordinate his judicial functions to his private profit, his private ease, or his protection from inquiry.

A good deal is said in the text of the Arbitration Act, and still more in the observations of the authors of this treatise, about the way in which the Courts of Law may be expected to rectify the mistakes of arbitration proceedings; but it may be affirmed at once that, in ordinary cases at any rate, the Courts are practically neither willing nor able to do anything to the purpose. It would seem as if artificially trained judicial minds are apt to consider, and very naturally so, that a private arrangement to prefer to their judgment that of an untrained, semi-civilised, makeshift tribunal, if it is to be recognised at all, becomes simply a convenient way of disposing of a certain undesirable class of disputes, undesirable not only on account of their concrete difficulty, but because of their intellectual insignificance. In other words, to be bothered about the awkward proceedings or blundering conclusions of a lay referee must be so particularly distasteful to a highly accomplished and busy judge on the bench, that it cannot be wondered at if his first and last impulse is simply to send the whole affair back again to the irregular adjudicator by way of a joke, with a brusque order that he shall reconsider it on his own level of intelligence, and, in short, go to Jericho with it; the only result of any practical kind being the payment by somebody of further and not inconsiderable bills of costs.

The special form of arbitration laid down in the London Building Act for work done to

party-walls is well known. A "party-wall" being, of course, the joint property of two owners, held in a sort of compulsory partnership which gives to each partner "an undivided moiety" of every brick, it clearly follows that whenever either of them proposes to alter the partnership property, he must submit his proposal to the other. To meet the possibilities of dispute in such circumstances—and in express recognition of the desirableness of dealing with those possibilities in a practical manner—the rule has long been established by law that a special tribunal of arbitration, composed of "surveyors" (meaning building experts, usually architects, and obviously not lawyers), shall be created for the occasion, endowed with all convenient authority. Now there is a peculiarity about the constitution of this tribunal which ought to be regarded with particular attention. Each of the "parties" appoints his "surveyor," and the two surveyors appoint a third; but this third is not the customary "umpire," his designation in the Act is "the third surveyor," and the award has to be made, not by him as supreme, but by any two of the three as equals. That this plan had proved satisfactory under the Act of 1855 was expressly evidenced by the fact that when the London County Council (or their legal draughtsman), in preparing the Bill for the new Act of 1894, substituted the common arrangement of umpirage, a simple representation of professional objection induced the immediate restoration of the other system. The advantages which must attach to this system in party-wall cases are easily perceived; but a more interesting question with us on the present occasion is whether it is not the most advantageous mode of procedure for almost all of our building references, if not indeed for almost all others in which the conditions are similar. There is, on the face of it, a substitution of the character of a friendly conference for that of a hostile contest; a free comparison of opinions takes the place of disingenuous examination and cross-examination; legal formalities and artifices disappear, with their mental reservations, ambiguities, and inferential fallacies. The graces of conciliation readily come in, and the conveniences of compromise; and in the result, instead of one side being technically altogether right and the other conventionally altogether wrong, it may turn out that both are right enough or both wrong enough for a settlement, if they will agree to be well advised. Of course there may be advanced perfectly valid reasons for a contrary opinion, and it seems to be the fact (as already mentioned) that amongst lawyers the employment of even two arbitrators, to say nothing of three, is considered to be unadvisable, it being always best, they say, to agree upon one. This doctrine is apparently based upon the desire to obtain what is called finality of decision. But it is usually found that such finality is largely due to the great pains that a single referee notoriously takes to protect himself by concealing or even disguising what is passing in his mind; and how far this practice is conducive either to a thorough comprehension of facts or to the economising of costs is a question that need scarcely be asked. On the other hand, the notion that to have three referees must involve a treble expense is quite a fallacy; for two of the three only take the place of the two leading witnesses who are otherwise necessary; besides that the attendance of supplementary witnesses of opinion may then be dispensed with.

The question of the costs of an arbitration is one that is of great, and in these days perhaps increasing, moment. That an arbitrator should be able to charge as much as he pleases without any previous understanding, to present no reckoning, and to retain the award as a secret judgment until his demand is paid, seems on the face of it to be a most unpleasant abuse of the confidence that has been placed in him, and a fatal degradation of his office. Some professional men who are much employed as referees make a point of mentioning their scale of charges at the outset, which is obviously the proper course; but there is a general impression that, when no such arrangement is made at the beginning, the "discretion" of the arbitrator covers a despotic right to pay himself too well at the end, and to evade criticism by refusing all particulars. Our authors tell us that "where the arbitrator

fixes the amount of the costs of the award in the award itself" (seemingly a very easy artifice) "his fees will not be liable to taxation unless they are so unreasonable in amount as to constitute misconduct"—but that "when an unreasonable amount is charged, and a party pays it under the *quasi*-compulsion of the award being withheld, the excess may be recovered back." Moreover, we learn that when one party, having taken up the award, has to receive costs from the other, "he cannot compel the other party to pay the excess." Thus by a roundabout way an overcharging arbitrator may sometimes be made to submit to taxation.

Returning, in conclusion, to the relations between architect and contractor, it becomes quite clear that every well-meaning architect will allow his builder to protect himself carefully against the risk of collision with a species of authority which the law regards as being primarily so very absolute. Perhaps it is that the old-fashioned conditions of mutual confidence are disappearing. Certainly in many other kinds of transactions sharp practice is in these days unfortunately extending its influence. It is to be hoped that the architectural profession at large may never part with those characteristics which have hitherto secured the exceptional confidence of builders. Nevertheless, as times change, we change with them; and where in other days a contractor could rely upon reputation, it may be necessary for him now to fall back on the rule of "safe bind, safe find." The "arbitration clause" must therefore be an accepted institution, and, what becomes of even more moment, the arbitrator must be judiciously chosen. The common saying, "I don't care who he is, I will leave it to anybody," is simply nonsensical. The judges of our Law Courts are carefully selected men; arbitrators in such a business as building ought to be carefully selected too, and, if possible, with special reference to the particular nature of the more probable disputes. Indeed, it is always safest to leave the nomination of an arbitrator until the nature of the questions at issue has become clearly developed, and then to select some one who is specially qualified to deal with questions of that class; or to agree upon some official person who shall make the appointment on that basis when the time comes.

Why should not the Royal Institute make official provision for the business of Architectural Arbitration? Even the establishment of a special examination and certificate might be of the greatest service, to the next generation if not to the present. Not so long ago it used to be remarked that the leading referees in London property cases, even in "valuation" by name, were almost all trained architects—such as Pownall, Clutton, Tite, Shaw, Lee, Clifton; now they seem to be estate agents, trained in a very different school, and certainly not a better.

FIFTY YEARS OF ARCHITECTURAL DRAUGHTSMANSHIP.

By R. SHEKLETON BALFOUR [A.],

Inst. Medallist 1892, Pugin Student 1894, Tite prizeman 1895, Soane Medallist 1896.

SELDOM, perhaps, has a collection of architectural drawings and designs been brought together combining more wide and educative interest than that which has lately been on view at the rooms of the Institute, in connection with the celebrations marking the completion of the semi-centenary of the active existence of the London Architectural Association. The admirable arrangement of this exhibition in chronological sequence on the various screens enabled us to grasp with clearness and facility, not only the evolution of present-day draughtsmanship, and the individual influences responsible for this evolution, but also to follow in more subtle fashion all the strange phases of alternating admiration and unpopularity which have been formulated in the inconstancy of architectural fashions during the last fifty years.

While the primary object which the Committee of the Architectural Association had in view was to illustrate the progress of draughtsmanship during this sentient period of architectural life, it seems at the same time scarcely possible to avoid altogether commenting on the infinitely wider recognition of the intrinsic merits of the various styles, which is, perhaps, the most predominant characteristic of architecture at the present day.

Only three decades ago it would have been no easy task to discover, within the sketch-books of any particular student, a drawing of some feature alien to the style of his adoption. Now, every zealous disciple of the Architectural Muse, without, I venture to think, any exception, will be found to accept, and therefore in some degree to realise and appreciate, the varied charms, not only of each individual style, but of each period of transition also. Let us, for instance, take the five most interesting sketch-books of the late Sir Gilbert Scott, which had been lent. We shall find in them not merely a collection of bits of detail and composition, but also what is practically a pictorial itinerary, indicating the extent and selective nature of his travels, and the vigilant and constant readiness of his pencil. Yet we may search these books in vain for the semblance of a classic moulding. Nay, even more, his eye was so single that there is little corroborative evidence in them even of sympathy with work of any other date than the exact type with which his name will always be associated.

Nowadays our note books are a medley of jottings of all sorts and of all dates of work; we admire them all, or each in turn; and though at the present time we may lean towards the work of post-reformation days, we are none the less equally ready to love and admire all that preceded it. Doubtless this is attributable to our increased possibilities in the study of a wider field of architectural literature, and to the enhanced opportunities for travel and sketching which fall to the lot of the fortunate student in these latter days.

A careful examination of the exhibition also reveals the greater thoroughness which obtains in our drawings now. Thirty or forty years ago it was the *effect* produced by detail which was aimed at in the sketch-book. Now we go more to the root of the matter to try and discover *how* the effect was produced. Formerly the measured drawing was not so largely in vogue as it is now, and the details of mouldings and enrichments were sketched to a small scale, with perhaps a few added dimensions at the side. Now our tendency is rather to reverse this process, and we draw our work out to scale on the spot, and persevere in making full-size drawings of all intricate and important portions. The perspective sketch is no longer the approved method to be followed on our sketching tours, for we have learned that a good draughtsman, unintentionally perhaps, renders any composition in some degree pleasant by his skilled pictorial representation; while the measured drawing, no matter how cleverly it may be executed, cannot mask either bad proportion or composition, which may perhaps be existent in the original. Further, since we usually design in plan and elevation, no mere sketch is sufficient to enable us to introduce into our designs those effects which we are desirous of transferring from old work.

The students' drawings of the last few years also tend to embody a paradoxical combination of slightness and elaboration; an amplitude of full-size details, coupled with an explanatory key-drawing of the whole for their elucidation. But in this we have the gist of the whole subject, a method surely preferable to the older one of filling in and completing the drawing with more or less accuracy, according to whatever the scale may be in which we are working.

It is futile even briefly to notice, individually, more than a few of the numerous drawings which have been lent; and in singling out for remark the few, the many must of necessity appear to be passed over, though they may in reality have an equal claim on our attention.

It is the older drawings, perhaps, that are more particularly worthy of inspection, for it is on the foundation of their experience that we have built up our present school of draughts-

manship, and also because they are the work of men who have since attained leading positions in their profession, and whose juxtaposition on the various screens relieves the exhibition of any of that monotony which is so frequently apparent in collections of the kind. It was fifty-two years ago when one of the earliest drawings shown in the exhibition was made. This is an elaborately inked-in water-colour drawing of a church porch, by Mr. J. K. Colling, which serves to illustrate the remarkable, though somewhat laboured, effort which was so frequently relied on in those days for effect. In quite a different vein, however, are the contributions of Mr. Alfred Waterhouse, R.A. Here are three quite delightful drawings evidently made on a sketching tour in 1853. These little pictures (they well merit the name) are on tinted paper, and are chiefly executed in sepia and cobalt, with touches of body-colour. The natural adaptability of such subjects for illustration as the entrance to the Doge's Palace or the outside staircase at the Palazzo-del-Capitano at Modena is largely enhanced by the skill with which they are treated, architecturally as well as pictorially. Mr. J. P. Seddon's drawings also show us that *æsthetic quality* was not altogether eclipsed in those days, when many of us were accustomed to imagine that architecture was divorced from its artistic pictorial representation.

Professor Aitchison's carefully drawn and coloured representation of a portion of the colour decoration of the Villa Madama, near Rome, is one of the earliest pieces of measured work shown. This drawing is characterised by great delicacy and refinement, and the colouring is realistic, though doubtless, had it been executed within the last decade, it would have been attacked with greater strength and virility of line and consideration for combined harmony of tone, rather than the individual exactitude of each tint in the original. Mr. Aitchison also lends several other measured drawings and water-colour sketches of interest.

How great is the contrast between these drawings and the adjacent ones of the late W. Burges, A.R.A., which are distinguished by a boldness and originality which even our most advanced draughtsmen might hesitate to commit themselves to nowadays. They are pregnant with the character of their author, whose resource and humour strikingly display themselves either in his well-known Mediaeval-looking drawing of a design for a fountain, his quaintly written note on a sketch of colour decoration for organ pipes, or in the numerous comic and sentimental leaves culled from his sketch-books, whose contents evidently were not entirely architectural.

In Mr. C. Forster Hayward's set of drawings we find some among them pioneers of the methods now approved by the candidates for the Pugin Studentship.

Passing on to the next decade, we have Mr. G. Edmund Street's very fine pen-and-ink drawing of a cathedral porch, an excellent example of his bold style of work, clear and distinct, and drawn in a good line.

Next we are confronted by Mr. T. Allom's designs for Manchester Town Hall, a very interesting set of sepia-tinted elevations, with foreground and sky put in. These clever drawings delicately convey the effect of the Gothic design they portray; but one cannot help wondering what chance such as these would have among the strong competition drawings of the present time, when startling effects vividly portrayed are thought more likely to compel the attention of an assessor than delicate drawing and somewhat nebulous design. There is a large and varied selection of the work of Mr. E. J. Tarver, including designs for furniture in the mid-nineteenth century type of Gothic, which show great fertility of conception.

Mr. R. Phené Spiers also is a prominent exhibitor, and lends, in addition to his fine water-colour views of the Parthenon, among others, a very impressionist coloured elevation of an entrance archway to a triumphal bridge, a design of colour decoration for a staircase, and a carefully tinted drawing of the pulpit in St. Stephen's, Walbrook, measured as part of his

work for the Royal Academy Silver Medal. In this decade also were a couple of charming little sketches by Mr. John Belcher; and Mr. H. L. Florence lent the large tinted elevation of his Royal Academy Gold Medal design 1869.

On the screens, dated 1870-80, were to be found the first examples of the measured drawing as we understand it now, notably Mr. Leonard Stokes's fine drawing of the arcading in the Lady Chapel, Ely Cathedral. This drawing is inked in brown, carefully and feelingly, and with a fine regard for and appreciation of his subject. Among Mr. W. Millard's contributions there was a very delightful little drawing of the west doorway, Cley Church, Norfolk, done in a most pleasing manner. Mr. F. Baggallay lent a good water-colour drawing of the Bargello staircase at Florence; and Mr. Aston Webb contributed a masterly sketch of the Porch at Chartres, made in 1875, a pencil drawing in the thin, clear, conscientious line, which only within the last two or three years has commanded all our sympathies, to the detriment of the pale-line and black-dot school which up to that time was chiefly popular among students.

There was a large amount of most interesting work shown illustrating the next decade, viz., 1880-90, and among the more prominent drawings were those of Mr. Francis Hooper of the fine piece of half-timber work at Rufford Old Hall, Mr. Needham Wilson's well-known sketch of the Porch of St. Trophime, Arles—an altogether charming drawing—and fine examples of the work of Messrs. Gerald C. Horsley, A. N. Paterson, W. A. Pite, and R. W. Schultz.

Mr. Alfred H. Hart showed an excellent measured drawing of the screen in the Chantry of Henry V., Westminster Abbey, and Mr. A. T. Bolton a large full-size coloured drawing of the mosaic head of Pomona, recently discovered at the excavations at Cirencester. Both these drawings indicate the thorough and persistent character of the work which is now considered indispensable as a means of educational development.

Among the designs were two which cannot fail to claim attention. The first of these was Mr. Beresford Pite's highly characteristic elevation of his design, which carried off the Soane Medallion in 1882, surely one of the most original efforts which have ever attained success before the Prizes Committee of the Royal Institute. The other was Mr. H. W. Brewer's beautiful drawing, entitled "Deserted," evidently an idealised view of some Mediæval German plague-stricken city. This is a masterpiece, not merely of architectural draughtsmanship, but also of architectural grouping and composition, and, in addition, combines with those qualities that distinctive sentiment which renders a drawing agreeable to the public at large.

The closing decade of the century was, as might be expected, more fully represented than any other, and presented a diversity of style and variety of subject which strongly attest the cosmopolitan taste of to-day. The representative selection of drawings of our cathedrals, lent by *The Buikler*, gave us, on an equal footing, specimens of the works of such draughtsmen as Messrs. J. Begg, W. H. Bidlake, T. Maclaren, C. E. Mallows, and A. B. Mitchell, which cannot be otherwise than instructive.

Mr. H. V. Lanchester gave us a delightful bit of coloured work in his "Part of the Front of the Mosque at Cordoba," a drawing which shows a rare feeling for his subject; and Mr. A. H. Hart, likewise, in his water-colour of the Tower at Verona, demonstrates that atmosphere and local tradition need not of necessity be lost sight of altogether in an architect's portrayal of architecture.

Of this period were also excellent drawings, among others, by Messrs. C. C. Brewer, H. C. Corlette, Owen Fleming, and E. A. Rickards, names which are a guarantee that the Architectural Association at the present day, as it did half a century ago, can claim among its members draughtsmen whose work fifty years hence will be as fully representative of their time as any that is shown in the exhibition.



9, CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 17th June 1897.

CHRONICLE.

The Special Examination for Associateship.

As the existence of this Examination seems not to have been made sufficiently public, and consequently is not very widely known, it appears desirable to direct to it the attention of readers of the JOURNAL. The Examination is held in the interests of "Architects in practice not less than twenty-five years of age, and chief assistants over thirty years of age, who desire to be Associates." Candidates are exempted by a resolution of the Council from the Preliminary and Intermediate Examinations, and, on certain probationary work being submitted and approved (except in the case of an architect who has been in active practice previous to the 1st January 1885), are admitted to the Final Examination. Full particulars are given in the KALENDAR, p. 265. It would greatly further the interests of the General Body if Allied Societies could take such steps as to bring this Examination prominently under the notice of their members who are not also members of the Royal Institute.

THE ANNUAL ELECTIONS.

THE COUNCIL.

At the Business General Meeting of Monday, 14th inst., the Council for the year of office 1897-98 were declared to be duly elected as follows:—

PRESIDENT.—Professor Aitchison, A.R.A.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.—William Milner Fawcett, M.A.Cantab., F.S.A.; Henry Louis Florence; Ernest George; and Edward Augustus Gruning.

HON. SECRETARY.—William Emerson.

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.—John Belcher; Thomas Blashill; James Brooks; John McKean Brydon; William Douglas Caröe, M.A.Cantab., F.S.A.; Thomas William Cutler; Campbell Douglas (Glasgow); John Alfred Gotch, F.S.A. (Kettering); Alexander Graham, F.S.A.; Charles Hadfield (Sheffield); Benjamin Ingelow; Edward William Mountford; John Slater, B.A.Lond.; Richard Phené Spiers, F.S.A.; Henry Heathcote Statham; Paul Waterhouse, M.A.Oxon.; Aston Webb, F.S.A.; and Ralph Selden Wornum.

ASSOCIATE-MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.—Edward Guy Dawber and Arthur Smyth Flower, M.A. Oxon., F.S.A.

REPRESENTATIVES OF ALLIED SOCIETIES.—William Larkins Bernard (Bristol Society); Albert Nelson Bromley (Nottingham Society); Thomas Drew, R.H.A. (Royal Institute of Ireland); John Ely (Manchester Society); Leslie Ower (Dundee Institute); Henry Perkin (York Society); Arnold Thorne (Devon and Exeter Society); and Edwin Montgomery Bruce Vaughan (Cardiff, South Wales, and Monmouthshire Society).

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION (London).—Hampden William Pratt.

THE STANDING COMMITTEES.

At the same Meeting the following Fellows and Associates were declared duly elected to serve on the respective Standing Committees for the ensuing year of office, viz.:—

ART STANDING COMMITTEE.

Fellows.—John Macvicar Anderson; John Belcher; James Brooks; John McKean Brydon; William Douglas Caröe, M.A.Cantab., F.S.A.; Ernest George; Edward William Mountford; Beresford Pite; Alfred Waterhouse, R.A.; and William Young.

Associates.—Robert Shekleton Balfour; Edward Guy Dawber; Owen Fleming; James Sivewright Gibson; Henry Thomas Hare; and John William Simpson.

LITERATURE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Fellows.—Henry Louis Florence; Alexander Graham, F.S.A.; Benjamin Ingelow; John Tavenor Perry; William Alfred Pite; Sydney Smirke; Richard Phené Spiers, F.S.A.; Charles Harrison Townsend; William Frederick Unsworth; and Paul Waterhouse, M.A.Oxon.

Associates.—Arthur Thomas Bolton; Arthur Smyth Flower, M.A.Oxon., F.S.A.; Andrew Noble Prentice; Ravenscroft Elsey Smith; Leslie Waterhouse, M.A.Cantab.; and Percy Scott Worthington, M.A.Oxon.

PRACTICE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Thomas Batterbury; Henry Cowell Boyes; Samuel Flint Clarkson; Edwin Thomas Hall; Thomas Harris; Alexander Henry Kersey; Joseph Douglass Mathews; Walter Hilton Nash; Lacy William Ridge; and Edmund Woodthorpe, M.A.Oxon.

Associates.—William H. Atkin-Berry; Francis Thos. Wilberforce Goldsmith; Frederick Henry Appleton Hardcastle; Henry Thomas Hare; George Richards Julian; and Augustus William Tanner.

SCIENCE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Fellows.—Lewis Angell, M.Inst.C.E.; Frederic Richard Farrow; John Salmon Quilter; Herbert Duncan Searles-Wood; William Howard Seth-

Smith; Percival Gordon Smith; Lewis Solomon; William Charles Street, Assoc.Inst.C.E.; Benjamin Tabberer; and Keith Downes Young.

Associates.—Henry William Burrows; Max Clarke; Robert Langton Cole; Bernard John Dicksee; Matthew Garbutt, Assoc.-M.Inst.C.E.; and George Pearson.

The late Charles John Phipps [F.]

Mr. Rashleigh Phipps has kindly furnished the following particulars of the professional career of his father, Mr. C. J. Phipps, whose death occurred on the 25th ult. :—

Charles John Phipps was born at Lansdowne, near Bath, in the year 1835. He was articled to Messrs. Wilcox & Fuller, architects, of Bath, and remained in their office till June 1857. After travelling for a year abroad he commenced practice as an architect at Bath. In 1862 he successfully competed for the design of the new theatre in that city, which was opened in March 1863. This theatre having proved successful, other works of a similar kind followed, and Mr. Phipps soon found that it was obviously in his interest to remove his practice to London. This accordingly he did, and for many years was engaged both in London and the provinces in building new theatres and remodelling old ones, besides carrying out many other works of a varied description. Mr. Phipps held the appointment of architect to the Committee of Drury Lane Theatre until the expiration of their lease. He had on several occasions been applied to by the Government to give evidence before the Committees of the House of Commons, especially in reference to theatres. Of his recent works, the new buildings now in course of erection in the Haymarket rank as the most important. Her Majesty's Theatre was opened on 28th April, and the Carlton Hotel, which is being built on the remaining part of the site, is making rapid progress. Among the many buildings which he has erected are the following: the Queen's, Long Acre; the Gaiety, the Vaudeville, the Strand, Sadlers Wells, the Variety, Hoxton; the Savoy, the Princess's, the Prince of Wales's, the Shaftesbury, 1888; the Lyric, 1889; Hengler's Cirque (recently altered by Mr. Phipps into the National Skating Palace), the Theatre of the Lyric Club, internal reconstruction of Lyceum, Comedy, St. James's, and Globe Theatres, the Queen's Hall (jointly with Mr. Knightley), and numerous theatres in the chief cities of the provinces, and in Scotland and Ireland. Among public buildings, other than theatres and concert halls, erected from his designs are: the Devonshire Club, the Lyric Club, Gaiety Restaurant, Strand; Star Life Assurance Society, 30 and 32, Moorgate Street, E.C.; Star and Garter Hotel New Pavilion, Richmond; offices for *The Observer* newspaper, Strand; the Savoy Turkish Baths, Savoy Street, Strand. Mr. Phipps became an Associate of the Institute in 1860, and a Fellow in 1866. He

served upon the Council during the years 1875–76. He was also a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries.

The late George Orrell [4.]

George Orrell, the son of the late Mr. Oliver Orrell, contractor, of Darwen, was born on 18th June 1867. He served his articles with Mr. Bertwistle, architect, of Blackburn, and was appointed to H.M. Office of Works on 1st May 1891 as an assistant-surveyor to Mr. John Taylor, C.B., in whose department he remained for the last six years of his life. His death, which occurred on the 10th ult., was the result of rapid consumption. Sadly enough, he had only been married about a month before. During his six years' service in H.M. Office of Works he assisted in the general work of the office, including the superintendence of large Government buildings in London. Mr. Orrell was elected an Associate in 1889.

The late J. J. Cole.

The Institute is indebted to Mr. Thos. Blashill [F.] for the following obituary notice :—

By the death, on 10th May, of John Jenkins Cole, F.R.A.S., of the Stock Exchange, one of the earlier Fellows of the Institute, which he joined in 1848, we have lost one who, while avoiding the ordinary means by which an architect may become known, achieved a reputation unique in its kind.

Born in 1815, at Devonport, the son of a solicitor who was well known as an antiquary, he was educated there, and afterwards at the Merchant Taylors' School, which he left at the age of sixteen. For two years he applied himself to the law under his father, who was then settled in London; but his taste soon led him towards architecture, which he studied under Mr. Alfred Ainger. In 1834 he was assisting Mr. Butler on plans for the enlargement of the old Houses of Parliament, and next spent a year in the practical study of masonry and carving and the technicalities of building work, completing his student career without the aid of foreign travel. In 1836 he drew Star Chamber, Westminster, for Weale's *Elizabethan Architecture*, and, having met Mr. (afterwards Sir Charles) Barry, assisted him in adapting competition designs for the new Houses of Parliament to the site. In his diary he writes: "I esteem it a great privilege to have worked under the constant and direct supervision of such a mind as Barry's"; and Barry's influence is noticeable throughout the work of his life. From 1837 he was assisting various architects, chiefly Mr. Rogers, for whom he worked twelve years, while clients of the quality essential to his methods of practice were finding their way to his door.

About 1846 he began his long connection with Throgmorton Street by altering the offices of

Messrs. Capel & Norbury, which he shortly afterwards rebuilt. A little later he designed schools at Kempsey, Worcestershire, in the Tudor style for Mr. Capel, and a church in the style of the thirteenth century at Abberley. In 1858, and for many years, he was carrying out work at Amesbury Abbey for Sir Edmund Antrobus, whose house, 146, Piccadilly, designed in 1863, in the Italian style, is among his more characteristic works.

In 1855 he had been elected architect to the Stock Exchange, and in 1860, 1872, and again in 1874, he carried out important works connected with their old house. From 1882 to 1888 he was constructing the new house, with office buildings fronting on Old Broad Street and Throgmorton Street, at a cost of £150,000. In 1872 he designed Messrs. Mabey's restaurant and offices, between the Stock Exchange buildings in Throgmorton Street. In 1874 he began his great building for the Gresham Assurance Company on the site of St. Mildred's, Poultry, which cost £80,000. These were his chief works.

He attempted no striking originality in general design, but nothing could exceed his laboriousness in matters of planning, materials, and details. He drew everything—large and small—with a hair-line; the profiles of his mouldings, more Greek than Roman, were his own, and were not influenced by cheapness of cutting or polishing. Every item of such work, placed never so far from the eye, had to stand his critical personal examination. He held that, in our narrow streets, ornament should be placed on reveals and soffits where it may be seen in passing, rather than on the outer face which few people observe. His foundations went down through the historic strata into the geological, with basement under basement and cellar under these. His construction was massive and, where possible, monolithic. He was almost the first to use polished granite in the City, making it carry the superstructure, supplementing it with the rarest antique marbles and blocks of Devonshire, specimens as to size. Where another architect would have laid on his more precious materials in thin slabs, he used them as solid ashlar. His polished facings went through the walls. He detested veneer, but when, in the adaptation of the old House at the Stock Exchange, his newer work had brought out the meanness of the adjacent plaster, thin slabs of the precious rose-tinted Giallo-Antico were applied in its place.

It is nobody's fault that the stranger, looking for the Bourse of the first commercial city in the world, is shown a row of Italian Palazzi, or that the interior wherein he showed his skill in planning, and his power to combine old and new into one richly effective whole, has to be jealously guarded from public view. These points may be seen by an illustration in *The Builder* of 8th October, 1887, and in the *Institute Journal*

of 1894. There are, no doubt, among the busy throng that there assembles, those who appreciate the effect. Mr. Cole's private clients spoke of their architect with affectionate regard, entering into the spirit of his extravagance and laughing over the cost. Of the many architects who came in contact with him through his great operations, those who struggled with him found a difficult antagonist; but to those who approached him in the honourable and straightforward spirit for which he was distinguished, he was the kind and courteous gentleman seeking to act as an umpire might do, and ready to assist them in every way.

He was much interested in the preservation of Stonehenge, which is upon the property of his client at Amesbury. His favourite pursuits outside his profession were geology and astronomy; and the house which he built for himself at Sutton, in Surrey, included an observatory, where he was one of the very few who saw the transit of Mercury in 1882. He was an excellent photographer, using his camera chiefly in relation to architecture and geology. He virtually retired from the profession in 1890, his son, Mr. R. Langton Cole, succeeding him at the Stock Exchange, to which he was appointed consulting architect. He did not long take an active part in the work of the Institute, though he was a member of the Council in 1855-56. He retired from the Institute in 1890.

Proposed International Central Laboratory.

The Iron and Steel Institute are issuing a circular in which they solicit subscriptions towards the establishment of a Central Laboratory, recommended by the International Society for the Unification of the Methods of Testing Materials of Construction. It is proposed to establish this Central Laboratory at Zürich, inconveniences possibly arising from international jealousies thus being avoided, and Herr Hans von Jüptner, chief chemist of the Neuberg Iron and Steel Works in Austria, has been chosen as the head of the new institution. Such a laboratory will do invaluable work, and it is to be hoped that the promoters will obtain the £2,000 a year the assurance of which is necessary for this undertaking.

REVIEWS. LV.

(154)

BEAUTY AND ART.

Beauty and Art. By Aldam Heaton. 8s. Lond. 1897. Price 6s. [Wm. Heinemann, 21, Bedford Street, W.C.]

This is a volume in which Mr. Aldam Heaton has brought together five essays written within the last few years. The last article may be known to some readers as forming the preface to the large work recently published under Mr. Heaton's editorship by Messrs. Bumpus, and consisting of repro-

ductions of furniture designs by Chippendale, Adam, Sheraton, and others. The author here quite makes good his point that it is owing to the French influence of such men as Androuet that the work of the first of these three designers came to be possible. He, like Molière, "prenait ses biens où il les trouvait," and many of the *motifs* that are supposed to be distinctly characteristic of the style known by his name may be found to be either based upon, or copied from, the work of Androuet, Berain, and Marot. The taste shown by Chippendale in his inclusion in the work by which he is principally known of many "preposterous, impossible, and outrageous" drawings of furniture in the "Chinese" and the "Gothic" styles shows him to have been rather the seller, whose main idea was the fashion of the hour, than the craftsman and the artist with a standard of the right and the proper. To call him, however, as Mr. Heaton does (p. 126), "as ignorant and pretentious a fellow as ever hawked his wares" is hardly reconcilable with the assurance on the same page that the copying of works by this maker is "greatly to the general advantage."

Much of what the author has to say in his five articles was evidently written some years ago, and before the last Arts and Crafts Exhibition, for instance, had shown that, try as they may, those dealing with the various arts of design cannot succeed in "cutting," as he says, "the well-anchored and safe cable of Tradition." Nothing is clearer than that, excluding a few, a very few, works proceeding from the members of eccentric

"Seet whose chief devotion lies
In odd perverse antipathies,"

the remaining exhibits indicated that the link with the past was too strong to be broken. They showed, indeed, that success was obtained just in proportion as the designs reconciled the conditions of to-day with sufficient reference to Tradition to avoid the charge of being ignorantly self-sufficient. As the author himself says (p. 99), "no craftsman in this world ever sprung by a stride into what was at once novel and good." And though "dans l'Art, mes enfants," says Verlaine, "c'est d'être absolument soi-même," we cannot even when thus ourselves escape being the "guests of the ages" fed from the scraps that fall from the table of old Tradition.

It is not altogether a matter of words; for though Mr. Heaton and the young men he runs afield against in his preface and in his second article both recognise Tradition as a factor in design, the latter would probably claim that they of the two take a surer, truer step in that path of Evolution in which Art, as the author says, must needs march. Tradition, of course, is not copyism—either of Chippendale chairs (p. 126) or of anything else.

Thus a catholic appreciation of the lesson of past work would not dismiss the whole of the

wonderful world of Japanese Art with Mr. Heaton's remark that "it is a little difficult to discuss it with patience and reasonableness." As a notable Frenchman says, "You should have preferences, but no exclusions." The measure of an artist's right to properly so describe himself is stated (p. 112) to be the power by which he has or has not "accurately delineated things." Thus tested, the Japanese designer fails to reach the author's standard; a conclusion rendered all the more quaint from the fact that it seems to most of us to be just in the characteristics of good "drawing" and "accurate delineation" that the artists of Japan excel. And only a little less logical is the lament that it is impossible to find a Japanese design "which readily arrived at a good repeat"!

Finally, and by the way, the second and fourth of these papers would appear, from a fly-leaf note, to have been delivered before a body there described as "the Architectural Institute of London." The name is new to the present writer—and perhaps to others.

C. HARRISON TOWNSEND.

THE MAGNETIC DIP OF ANCIENT TERRA-COTTAS.

BY THE CAVALIERE GIACOMO BONI [*Hon. Corr. M.*].

The dip of a loadstone or magnetised needle was observed by George Hartmann, of Nuremberg, more than three centuries and a half ago, and was commented upon by him in a letter, dated 4th March 1544, to the Duke Albrecht of Prussia. The prototype of the modern dipping needle was constructed in the year 1576 by Robert Norman, and some measurements were taken with it by Gilbert of Colchester (1540-1603), the "Galileo of magnetism."

It is well known that the loadstone can transmit to iron with which it comes in contact a permanent property like its own, and that the earth itself, as a larger loadstone, produces the same effect; so that, by placing a non-magnetic bar of soft iron in the line of the magnetic meridian, with its axis in the direction of the earth's force (*i.e.* parallel to the line of dip), it will be magnetised inductively, in such a way that its lower end becomes a north pole, and its upper end a south pole. Usually a certain proportion of the magnetism remains after the inducing force is removed.

The phenomenon of magnetisation is, however, not confined to iron, but becomes apparent in other materials of which it forms a very small constituent. One of these materials, the ferruginous silicate of alumina, happens to have been—both baked and unbaked—the most extensively used for architectural and domestic purposes, in the shape of bricks and pots.

The ferrous-ferric oxide, which constitutes the magnetic substance of baked clays, possesses a

great coercitive force, very little inferior to that of steel, that is to say, the power to store up and preserve the magnetic conditions under which it was baked.

Among these magnetic conditions, the most important, from an historic or even prehistoric point of view, is the magnetic inclination or dip; because, as it slowly changes according to what we must assume to be a natural law, we have in terra-cotta a material giving us data to ascertain the age in which some of the objects made with it were baked, and the means to trace or follow the track of this law in prehistoric ages.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century, R. Boyle knew that terra-cottas were permanent load-stones, magnetised according to the direction of the terrestrial magnetism in the place and time they were baked. In the years 1862-63, Gherardi published in our magazine, *Il nuovo Cimento*, some results of his experiences on the polar magnetism of brickwork in Turin, and of Etruscan and Roman terra-cottas, and announced the principle that baked clays retain magnetism in the same direction in which they first conceived it, even for centuries after they were baked.

The subject has lately been resumed, and some interesting experiments were made by Dr. Folgheraiter, the clever assistant of the Physical Institute of the Roman University, who has extended his researches to many instances of brickwork of ancient buildings, palaces, temples, therma, and tombs of Rome and the Campagna, and ascertained that even volcanic rocks employed by Roman architects, such as tufa and lavas, in the primitive walls of Roma quadrata, in the basement stairs of the temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum, in the round temple at the Bocca della Verità, in the walls of Servius Tullius, in the Claudian aqueduct, in the Colosseum, &c., so well retain the primitive magnetic direction that in some cases it points exactly to inverted poles. We may here mention that Melloni, in examining the fragments of leucitophire and of other lavas employed in the amphitheatre of Pompeii, found them magnetised in every possible direction.

In order to familiarise himself with the subject, and to collect data regarding the way in which terrestrial magnetism became fixed in terra-cottas, Dr. Folgheraiter manufactured a series of clay cylinders of different sizes, and vases of different shapes, and had them baked in a vertical position and at different inclinations (see *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, classe di Scienze, anno 1896). Then he applied the results of these investigations to some vases of the Etruscan epoch, which, judging from their shape, had been baked in a vertical position. In four terra-cotta *cistæ* (eighth century B.C.), preserved in the museum of the Villa Giulia, the south polarity was found prevalent round the base, and the north polarity at the top of the handle. *Oinochoai* of the same epoch gave the same results, which seem

to prove that at the time and place where the vases were baked a magnetic needle would have dipped towards the south pole instead of the north one, as at present. The measurements made gave results which vary from $2^{\circ} 29'$ to $25^{\circ} 37'$, owing to the difficulty of making the corrections necessitated by the imperfections of the vases, and so could assign within very narrow limits the date of those vases, which from their peculiar shape had undoubtedly been baked in a vertical or otherwise determined position.

On the whole, the results of the investigations carried out at present on the history of magnetisation point to the necessity of experimenting on materials which do not leave any uncertainty as to the date, place, and position of their baking. A series of such materials ought to be offered by brick walls which have been subjected to fire, such as the Great Council Hall of the Ducal Palace in Venice, burnt A.D. 1577, and of a great many buildings which suffered from the same cause, including some ancient Roman, and possibly even some Assyrian ones. Volcanic eruptions of historical date may also give us the means of ascertaining the magnetic dip, which they have fixed and embodied in cooling down into hard stone, and that which they have caused the structures to assume with which they came into contact, as is the case at Herculaneum.

Although some of these investigations can be carried out in Italy, their nature requires them to be extended over the largest possible field, and to the utmost limits of historic age. For this reason I hope that the Royal Institute of British Architects, recognising the peculiar interest of the subject, and the possibility that some un hoped-for light may be thrown on the date of some important structures, or of the date at which the enemy destroyed them by fire, will ask its members to contribute a notice of such buildings that exhibit the magnetic dip produced at some period of their existence.

The cipollino columns of the Temple of Serapis at Pozzuoli have preserved for us a record of the geological changes of that territory. Let us hope that scientists may be able to point to some ancient monuments as historical archives of the law of terrestrial magnetism.

Note.—In studying the magnetism of terra-cotta vases, Dr. Folgheraiter has adopted the scheme of dividing into twelve parts the circumference of the base, and that of the mouth or upper rim of each vase (vases, be it understood, of symmetrical shape around a vertical axis at the moment of baking), and measuring the magnetism of each of these divisions of 30 degrees by means of a magnetic needle conveniently suspended and carrying a circular mirror, which serves for the reading of the variation by means of a theodolite.

The force of the positive and negative magnetism, the poles and the magnetic meridian of the vase being known, the magnetic inclination

(dip) is deduced by calculating the resultant of the two vertical and horizontal components.

For instance, in subjecting to experiments a Greek amphora of the Museum of Florence, No. 1800 (about 650-500 B.C.), Dr. Folgheraiter read the following deviations:—

Around the base.	Around the upper edge (orlo).
+ 223.0	+ 211.0
178.0	179.0
121.5	130.0
8.0	44.5
- 119.5	- 66.5
215.0	134.5
223.5	147.5
190.5	118.0
147.5	74.0
1.0	+ 69.0
+ 149.5	155.0
+ 191.5	180.0

The maxima and minima of these numbers being considered to belong to the magnetic meridian of the amphora, the following diagram is obtained:—

+ 211.0	— 147.5
+ 223.0	— 223.5

the vertical component

$$= \frac{(223.0 - 211.0) - (-223.5 + 147.5)}{2}$$

$$= \frac{11 + 76}{2} = 43.5;$$

the horizontal component

$$= \frac{223.0 - (-223.5) + 211 - (-147.5)}{2}$$

$$= 402.5;$$

the inclination of the magnetic force (dip)

$$= \text{arcotg. } \frac{43.5}{402.5} = 6^{\circ} 11'.$$

NOTES, QUERIES, AND REPLIES.

The Lotus Column.*

From Professor FLINDERS PETRIE—

The explanation of the reticence of M. Foucart, on the evolution of the lotus column from mud and reed building, which he merely glanced at in his work, is due to the able author. It seems that he was not free to follow his own system, as his essay was a thesis for a degree, which he had to publicly discuss for a whole day before seven judges, to whom such subjects were a novelty in

* See Professor Petrie's review of Monsieur Foucart's *Histoire de l'Ordre Lotiforme*, ante, p. 361.

any case, and who would not readily have followed a hypothetical derivation, however obvious to a mind trained in the subject. Truly this was working in chains.

Trafalgar Square.

From JNO. HEBB [F.]—

Professor Aitchison's suggestion, made in the course of the discussion on Mr. H. H. Statham's Paper on the Government Offices, that Nelson's Column, Trafalgar Square, should be removed to Leicester Square, is an admirable one so far as it goes, but does not go far enough. The column, which is directly in the line of foot traffic, and, as the late Lord Leighton said of another misplaced monument, emphasises nothing, dwarfs and overshadows the buildings in the vicinity, and might be got rid of with advantage. The puzzle is to know why the column was placed where it stands; no architect could have placed it there, and it can only be conjectured that its position was determined by some former First Commissioner of Works and Buildings.

It is a matter for serious consideration whether the time has not arrived, not merely for the removal of Nelson's Column, but also for the obliteration from our Metropolis of the memorials of warfare. The principal square of Paris is named Place de la Concorde, a name which was given it during the Revolution, and which has been unchanged through successive dynasties, as the principal square of London is named after a victory obtained over a neighbouring, and now a friendly, nation, obtained three-quarters of a century ago, and is decorated with the unrecognisable effigy of a naval hero in a ridiculous position on the top of a huge column guarded by shapeless masses of bronze which are supposed to be emblematical of British valour and British indifference to art. This display is a relic of barbarism and should be abolished. We no longer set up the skulls of our enemies about our wigwams, nor do we hang their scalps around our waists as trophies of our prowess; and it is time we should cease to wound the susceptibilities of a proud and sensitive nation by this childish parade of our victories.

"However we may rejoice at the successes of our country," says Leigh Hunt in one of his letters, "war is at all times unreasonable to our judgments, and shocking to our hearts," and every right-minded man will endeavour to efface the recollection of warfare from his memory instead of endeavouring to perpetuate it.

In the year 1362 the Florentines bore away the massive chain which defended the entrance to the Porto Pisano at Pisa, and hung the chain in triumph in the Baptistery at Florence, where it remained until the year 1848—the year of revolution—when it was restored to the Pisans by decree of the Municipality of Florence, as is attested by the following inscription affixed to the wall of the

Campo Santo at Pisa, where the chain is now hung.

Queste catene del Porto Pisano nel 1362 dai Genovesi rapite e donate ai Fiorentini, stettero per secoli appese in Firenze, trofeo di ira fraterna, con solenne voti di quel Comune nel 1848 restituite e per decreto del Municipio Pisano infisse nelle mura di questa splendide sede di tante glorie, siano augurio di amicizia e concordia tra le città Italiane, pegno e segnacolo d'una era novella.

Let us in a similar spirit remove Nelson's Column from its present position, together with Brummel's fat friend (who was certainly not present at Trafalgar, although he is said to have believed he was at Waterloo), the lumpy statues of Napier and Havelock, and the more graceful one of Gordon; abolish the fountains and the steps at the angles of the square, construct a wide flight of steps on the axis of the National Gallery leading from the terrace on the north side of the square, lay out the square as a garden, and rename the square after some benefactor of his country.

THE SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.

The Fellows Question.

Pursuant to the notice issued to members convening a Special General Meeting to receive and consider the Report of the Council on the Election of Candidates for Fellowship, such Meeting duly assembled on the 31st May, the President, Professor Aitchison, A.R.A., being in the Chair. The Report to be considered was as follows:—

The attention of the Council having been drawn to the falling-off in the number of candidates for the Fellowship, pointedly alluded to in Mr. Penrose's Presidential Address of November 1895, they appointed in December 1895 a special Committee to consider and report on the whole subject. The Committee held numerous meetings, and obtained the views of the Allied Societies and of individual members of the Institute. The various suggestions were fully considered and discussed, and the Council now beg leave to submit to the General Body the following Resolutions numbered 1 to 10:—

1. That the proportion of one vote against, to two in favour, exclude from election, in place of one against, to four in favour, as at present.
2. That the form of voting-papers be altered, so that the names on the list voted against have to be crossed out.
3. That attention be called to the requirements of the Council as to the drawings, &c., to accompany an application for Fellowship.
4. That a circular be issued to all Associates who have been over ten years in that class, pointing out that, in the interests of the

Institute, it is desirable that Associates who are eligible should come forward for election as Fellows.

5. That when the Council of the Institute receive a unanimous recommendation formally submitted by the Council of any Allied Society that a practising member of the profession in their district is eligible and worthy of being elected a Fellow, the Council shall have the power to elect him.
6. That power be given to the Council to admit annually to the Fellowship, without ballot, the President or President-elect of any or all of the Allied Societies who are eligible and apply for admission.
7. That it be recommended to the Council to dispense with the payment of an entrance fee in the case of non-Metropolitan Fellows during the pleasure of the Council.
8. That it be recommended to the Council to utilise the old Council-room on the first floor as a tea and smoking room, and that no books from the Institute Library be consulted therein with the exception of periodicals and the professional journals.
9. That it be recommended to the Council to consider the desirability of holding periodical conferences, meetings, and dinners, a certain proportion thereof to take place in the provinces, with a view to promoting more friendly intercourse with the Allied Societies.
10. That it be recommended to the Council that the Allied Societies be invited to arrange, when possible, the date of election of their officers and the duration of their Sessions, so as to correspond with those of the Institute.

In the event of the foregoing Resolutions being approved, it will be necessary to alter certain By-laws, and the Council now propose the necessary alteration in those By-laws as follows:—

By-law 9. "One negative vote to two affirmative," *instead of* "one negative to four affirmative."

The following paragraph to be added thereto:—

Provided always that when the Council of the Institute receive a unanimous recommendation formally submitted by the Council of any Allied Society that a practising member of the profession in their district is eligible and worthy of being elected a Fellow, the Council shall have power to elect him. The Council may also admit annually to the Fellowship, without ballot, the President or President-elect of any or all of the Allied Societies who may be eligible and apply for admission.

By-law 15, clause (a), to be added to as follows:—

Provided always that the Council may, during their pleasure, dispense with the payment of an entrance fee in the case of non-Metropolitan Fellows.

DISCUSSION.

The Report, copies of which had been sent to every member resident in the United Kingdom, having been formally presented and taken as read, Mr. Wm. Woodward [A.] asked whether, under section 23 of the Charter, Associates were entitled to vote on all the resolutions before the Meeting. The President replied that the section was explicit, and that Associates were free to vote on all matters except "in respect of the making and adopting, altering, revising, suspending, or rescinding of any by-law."

The Secretary, in reply to questions of which notice had been duly given by Mr. H. Hardwicke Langston [A.], stated that the Special Committee appointed to report on the Election of Fellows had held eight meetings, and that the names of members forming the Committee, and the attendances of each, were as follows:—Professor Aitchison, A.R.A., 8 attendances; Messrs. J. Macvicar Anderson, 8; Charles Barry, F.S.A., 2; John Belcher, 4; W. H. Atkin-Berry, 5; Thos. Blashill, 3; James Brooks, 2; J. M. Brydon, 8; W. D. Caröe, F.S.A., 1; Alfred Culshaw (Liverpool), 4; E. J. Dodgshun (Leeds), 0; Thos. Drew, R.H.A. (Dublin), 1; Wm. Emerson, *Hon. Sec.*, 7; Ernest George, 4; J. S. Gibson, 3; John Goodacre (Leicester), 1; Alex. Graham, F.S.A., 4; Charles Hadfield (Sheffield), 2; Edwin T. Hall, 3; Wm. Henman (Birmingham), 3; John Holden (Manchester), 0; James Jerman (Exeter), 1; E. W. Mountford, 0; Joseph Oswald (Newcastle), 1; F. C. Penrose, F.R.S., 3; Beresford Pite, 2; John Slater, 4; R. Phené Spiers, F.S.A., 3; Alfred Waterhouse, R.A., L.L.D., 5; T. Lennox Watson (Glasgow), 1; Aston Webb, F.S.A., 6; W. L. Bernard (Bristol), 1; E. M. Bruce Vaughan (Cardiff), 1; T. Butler Wilson (Leeds), 1.

The reasons for the appointment of the Committee and the terms of the reference to them having been briefly discussed, the adoption of the Report was moved by Mr. John Slater [F.] and seconded by Mr. Aston Webb [F.].

Mr. H. HARDWICKE LANGSTON [A.] moved as an amendment that it was inexpedient to confer upon the Council the additional powers proposed by the resolutions. The Council apparently were afraid the class of Fellows would die out altogether, for they were opening the doors so widely that Fellows would be admitted without due scrutiny. Was it likely to raise the status and dignity of the class if Fellows were to be admitted in the manner recommended? Again, what had the Council done that they should be given these extra powers? What had they done towards the advancement of the objects of the Institute that they should rob the Associates of the advantage of voting conferred upon them by the Supplemental Charter? Why should the Council be empowered to invite candidates to come in, when they had not even applied for the Fellowship? It was a most undignified proceeding. Had members such confidence in the Council that they could give them a full and blank cheque in this way? He for one had not that confidence to be party to granting them the extra powers asked for in order that they might fill the place with Fellows. Neither would it be consistent with the dignity of the Fellowship to abolish the entrance fee in the case of non-Metropolitan candidates.

Mr. H. JONES LANCHESTER [A.] seconded the amendment. He wished to protest strongly against interfering with the liberty of election. The General Body should have the power of election. It was the strongest

safeguard of any Government, the strongest safeguard of every institution, that all the members should have a right of vote. They wanted no artificial means of bringing Fellows in. They were quite satisfied with the existing system, and required no encouragement from the Council. He referred to Resolution No. 1. No. 5 was rather worse; it was full of all sorts of unpleasant possibilities, and he for one should be sorry to see such a resolution passed by the Institute. Free election was the best way of keeping up the dignity of the Institute. If that were broken down, disaster would ensue.

Mr. ASTON WEBB [F.] thought that the Report would be better understood if a little explanation were given of it. When the resolutions were first proposed they were brought before the General Body in July last year, and discussed, mainly with regard to the proportion of votes, the voting papers, and the requirements of the Council from candidates proposed as Fellows. Subsequently a further Report was sent round by the Council to the Allied Societies, who had expressed a desire for further time to consider the matter; and the Council had the advantage of their views upon it. With regard to the attendance of members of the Committee, it was small in the case of country members—indeed their attendance at every meeting was not expected; but all the Allied Societies held meetings in their own towns, and the result of those meetings was very carefully reported to the Institute Council. During the negotiations with the Allied Societies they all expressed a wish to take a larger interest in the concerns of the Institute, and one very general wish was expressed that if a local Society unanimously put before the Institute Council the name of a gentleman who was desirous of becoming a Fellow of the Institute, the Council should then have power after the usual inquiries to elect him without going to a general ballot. The same drawback was pointed out by nearly all the Allied Societies, that many men in the country might be desirable Fellows of the Institute, and yet they might not be known to a large number of Metropolitan Fellows. That was the reason this suggestion was made, and it seemed to the Council to be a reasonable one. The proposal was hemmed round with a great many precautions. One was that there must be a unanimous recommendation from the local body. The Council, of course, would not dispense with the ordinary form of application by candidates; that would have to come as soon as the recommendation from the local Society had been received by the Council.

Mr. H. HARDWICKE LANGSTON [A.] here asked leave to withdraw his amendment in favour of one to be moved by Mr. Vaughan Lanchester.

Mr. H. VAUGHAN LANCHESTER [A.] moved as an amendment that "this Meeting is of opinion that, in consequence of the limited scope of the reference to the Special Committee, the adoption of the Council's Report will not be in the best interests of the Institute, and that the Report be referred back in order that the state of the Institute and its members may be more fully considered." That might seem a drastic suggestion to make on the Report of a Committee that had sat for some time, and had gone very fully into the subject; but exception was taken to the finding of the Committee because it was considered that the matter had been dealt with in too narrow a light. The Committee had simply considered how to bring more Fellows into the Institute, without going back further and considering whether the mere fact of introducing more Fellows into the Institute was in itself a desirable thing. It might be desirable apart from other considerations, but if the introduction of a greater proportion of Fellows lowered the status of the Fellows one iota, no increase in their number would compensate for that defect. The Report was of a distinctly reactionary character, and, if adopted, would tend to lower the status

of Fellows, which the Institute from time to time had made enormous efforts to raise. That should be their first aim—to raise the status of the Fellows. Complaints had been made that the Associates did not attempt to come into the class of Fellows with the alacrity that they should. How was that to be expected when in the near future it was probable, if the Committee's recommendations were adopted, that the status of Fellows would be lowered? A Fellow's professional capacity might be considered rather below that of the Associate. The Associate worked his way energetically up into the position he holds, whereas the Fellow was admitted by all sorts of little back doors. The general feeling of the Associates was not antagonistic to the Fellows. They merely wanted to feel that the Fellows were more above them, and that it was a class to which they could legitimately aspire, and one which would carry with it some addition to their status. If the recommendations of the Report were adopted, it would be much more difficult for the twenty or thirty men who knew something against the candidate to effectively vote against him in order that he might be rejected. The proportion at present seemed fair and reasonable, viz. that one vote against to four in favour should exclude a man; but if it were changed to one vote against to two in favour, those who voted for a man simply because they knew nothing against him would in every case outvote those who might know something very definite. It should not be their policy to drag in Fellows by hook or by crook from all the corners of the earth simply to swell their numbers. The Institute was financially a perfectly stable body, and additional subscriptions were not needed. The whole Report seemed framed on a wrong basis, due either to the limited reference or to the limited outlook of the people who framed it. It was so drastically reactionary that members should vote against it.

Mr. SYDNEY B. BEALE [A.] seconded Mr. Lanchester's amendment. While able to support six or seven of the resolutions of the Report, there were two or three others which he disagreed with entirely, one being the proposal to alter the form of voting; another, the proposal to issue circulars to the Associates; and thirdly, the admission of Fellows from the country who were recommended by certain small local bodies. He was of opinion that the resolutions had been drawn up apparently without any regard to the position of members, but drawn up in order to widen the doors for men to come in who were not up to the Metropolitan standard of eligibility for the Institute. There were no difficulties in the way of eligible men becoming Fellows, but the Committee, he was convinced, had not fully and carefully gone into the causes which were operating against candidates coming forward. As to Associates becoming Fellows, what advantages did they derive from the change? In the first place, they had to dip their hands into their pockets some two and a half times deeper. In the second place, they had to keep a list of the works they had executed. But that seemed to prove that the Associate was getting on very well as an Associate if he had done all those works, and was no strong argument for him to change his status. Then, again, upon the question of election, a candidate had not even the satisfaction of knowing that he had the unanimous wish of the Institute that he should be a Fellow. Further, the result of the first resolution would be that, though something like five hundred men might object to the election of a Fellow, yet he would be elected. That seemed a reason why Associates and others did not come flocking in great numbers to become Fellows. In his opinion these points had not been considered by the Committee, and therefore he seconded the amendment.

Mr. J. M. BRYDON [F.] said that it had been remarked that the Report had not been well considered.

He could say that it had been extremely well considered. It was a subject hedged round with no end of difficulties. They were face to face with the fact that there was a paucity of candidates for the Fellowship. That was not desirable in an Institute claiming to represent the profession. The Report affected two classes: one class composed of architects in the country who exhibited unwillingness to join the Institute as Fellows, and the second composed of those Associates unwilling to proceed to the Fellowship. In order to find out the reasons with regard to the first class, the Committee took counsel with all the Allied Societies as fairly representing the country members, and their objections mainly fell under two heads. One was a reluctance to submit themselves to the vote of the mass of the Institute, the votes being given probably by men who knew little or nothing about them as artists or as to their standing as professional men; and the second was undoubtedly an objection that many men in the country did not see why they should pay four guineas as an annual subscription when probably they would not enter the Institute doors once in six months. The majority of the Allied Societies who were consulted had an idea that the subscription for country members ought to be reduced. In deference to the feelings of a certain section about the voting for the candidates, it was proposed that the voting should be altered. He could not see that, if the proportion of votes for and against were altered, it would have much effect. With regard to the monetary question, under clause 7, it was proposed to meet this objection by waiving the entrance fees for a time. That was a concession purely out of sympathy for members in the country who represented to the Committee that it was rather a pull on them, as they did not get the same advantages as the Metropolitan members. There was no disposition whatever to let men in by the back door. The crux of the whole question lay in No. 3; and if that clause were read carefully, members would see that there was no disposition whatever to reduce the status of Fellows. It was a regulation of the Council that all persons who made application for the Fellowship should not only fulfil the ordinary conditions of a respectable member of society, but prove to the satisfaction of the Council, after his designs had been looked over, that the quality of his work was up to a certain standard. If that were insisted on, the status of the Fellowship would be raised, and the Fellowship would be an object which Associates and every one who was not a member of the Institute would aspire to attain to, because it would be a recognition of his merits as an architect, and he might also say of his merits as an artist. Clause 4 touched the other point of the matter. What he had said in regard to testing the quality of a man's work seemed to be very essential; but long before that question cropped up it was foreseen that steps would eventually have to be taken to induce Associates to come up for the Fellowship. An architect could get on very well without being either an Associate or a Fellow; so that the argument which cut against the Fellowship would certainly cut against the Associateship. Putting the whole thing broadly, they were all anxious that the Institute should grow, and they should all be anxious that the status of the Fellowship should be raised rather than lowered. There was no intention to elect a man simply because he was recommended by an Allied Society; he must satisfy the requirements of the Council first, and the stronger they made the hands of the Council in raising the qualification of his work, the higher would be the status of the Fellowship, and the more desirable would it be that a man should come up in the ordinary course for the Fellowship.

Mr. R. PHENÈ SPIERS [F.], replying to a question whether the process of blackballing in any other learned Society was similar to that now proposed, said that the

voting in most of the learned Societies was taken in the room, and that made a very great difference. He did not think that any Society except the Institute voted by balloting. In the Arts and Water Colour Societies the proportion of votes was two for to one against. With regard to Mr. Lanchester's point that no regard was paid to the status, of late years the status of Fellows had been very carefully considered—much more so than formerly. All the drawings were examined most carefully, and not only as regards their artistic merit, but as a whole they were required to be such as to justify the filling up of the ranks of the Fellows from outside. The desire was to raise the status of Fellows. Mr. Beale had said that there was no serious question about men from the country. If Mr. Beale would take the trouble to compare the numbers of the past few years he would find that there was a very serious falling-off. It no doubt commenced with an unfortunate vote taken some years ago, when some very eligible candidates were rejected, including a man sixty years of age who was well known throughout the country, and who was excluded because he had not passed the examination. Of one alteration he was in favour, viz. "That the form of voting papers should be altered." The point was that a great number of members would not take the trouble to vote for a person if they did not know his name, and so that person would in all probability be rejected, notwithstanding the testimony of the proposer and seconder that the candidate was a good man. If members did not vote for such a candidate the abstention was counted as an adverse vote; and therefore it was advisable to alter the regulation, so that, unless the name were scratched out, the vote would be taken as affirmative.

Mr. H. C. BOYES [F.] endorsed what Mr. Spiers had said about the provincial gentlemen coming up for election. He spoke from his own knowledge in the City. At the present time many well-known gentlemen would not come forward because they believed there was a clique who would do all they could to prevent their being elected. As a Body founded to promote the interests of architecture all over the country, and also to influence the art in other parts of the world besides our own Empire, the Institute ought to gain all the strength it possibly could. Architects ought to be united. If great men and able men were kept outside the Institute, were they serving their own interests and the interests of the public? He knew a great many architects in the City who certainly ought to be Fellows, but they would not become candidates for the Fellowship because it was said that every one who came from the City was blackballed.

Mr. J. S. GIBSON [A.] said that the friction with regard to the election of Fellows arose a few years ago because a certain candidate, who would have made undoubtedly a very good Fellow of the Institute, happened to be blackballed because his name was put forward on the voting list in company with another who was not a desirable candidate. The trouble arose entirely through a mistake, if he might so term it, of the Council in putting forward those names together. The whole thing could have been obviated then, and it could very easily be obviated now, by challenging the name of any particular candidate who came up for election, and issuing separate voting lists on these names. There would be no chance then of one man being confounded with another. The falling-off in candidates for the Fellowship, he contended, was not due to the blackballing incident referred to. Speaking from memory, the candidates for the Fellowship increased steadily for a great many years, but about three years ago they fell off very much, and in almost equal proportions. Provincial and London men fell off equally, which proved that the paucity of candidates for the Fellowship was not because provincial members or outsiders did not wish to come up. Consequently the three clauses, 5, 6, and 7, which were framed wholly for the benefit of non-Metropolitan members, were not at all necessary. They were simply a sop

to tempt non-Metropolitan members to come forward. Some speakers had characterised the first of these clauses as "back doors." That was a matter of individual opinion. With regard to the first proposition as to altering the proportion of votes which would keep a man out, even taking that 400 papers were returned, though the total number issued was over 1,500, that still meant that from seventy to eighty members were required on the present basis to exclude gentlemen who were not thought to be desirable candidates; and if that quantity were doubled it would make it practically prohibitive.

THE PRESIDENT at this point drew attention to the lateness of the hour, and, having regard to the fact that several members desired to speak on the question, suggested the adjournment of the Meeting to the 14th June, whereupon Mr. Woodward [A.] formally moved, and Mr. Phené Spiers [F.] seconded, the adjournment. Before the motion was put from the Chair,

Mr. OWEN FLEMING [A.] observed that the Associates had moved this amendment to the original motion with very great regret. If the President would say that the Council would like an opportunity, after hearing the views that had been expressed at the Meeting, of reconsidering the matter to a certain extent, and possibly getting some further details and statistics, he fancied it was not beyond the great ability that the Council exercised in most of their operations to prepare a Report that would be unanimously accepted both by Fellows and Associates, and be the starting point for a fresh lease of life for the Institute.

THE PRESIDENT, having observed upon the difficulties of the course suggested by Mr. Fleming, and upon the hardship of calling together again the members of the Committee, many of whom were gentlemen in busy practice in the provinces, asked the Meeting to vote upon the adjournment. The sense of the Meeting was thereupon taken by show of hands, and the motion for the adjournment declared to be lost.

Mr. WM. WOODWARD [A.] said that, having moved the adjournment, he should like to make one or two observations on the original motion. The great success of the Surveyors' Institution and the secret of the confidence placed in that body by the public generally were due to the enlargement of its area and of its members. The Council of the Surveyors' Institution had taken great pains in the selection of all their Fellows and members to secure that they were the best men possible to get even in the provinces. He agreed with the resolution of the Committee that there could be no better criterion of a provincial man's eligibility for the Institute than the unanimous opinion of his brethren in that particular district that he was worthy of the Fellowship. He hoped members would have confidence in the gentlemen to whom these questions were to be referred, because, as Mr. Aston Webb had stated, all possible care would be taken, and no one who was not thoroughly eligible and thoroughly respectable would be admitted by the Council.

Mr. FRANK LISHMAN [A.] asked to be allowed to say a word or two in the interests of provincial members. What was the definition of a practising member? Take, for instance, managing assistants who had acquired the status in certain offices of men fitted to become Fellows, and who would be eligible as Fellows. It was quite impossible for them to become members without going through the Associates' examination, which seemed the great deterrent to many men, especially the seniors among them. It was not right that they should be kept out. On the question of entrance fees the Associates should have consideration for the country members in that respect. He should be glad to hear any argument why provincial architects should become Fellows. As regards the Council electing men who were Presidents or Presidents-elect of Allied Societies, the Council were in rather an unenviable position should they feel bound to veto a man

who had been put up by an Allied Society simply because he was a President or President-elect of that Society.

MR. HUGH STANNUS [F.] thought it would be only fair before the vote was taken that those members who agreed with the Report should have an opportunity of stating their views. A great deal had been said about raising the status of the Fellows. Every one had that object in view. But there was another point—viz. raising the status of the Council. He would like to see the Council strengthened. The Council had come to the Institute with this Report, asking that their hands should be strengthened, and yet members hesitated to trust the very men they elected to conduct the affairs of the Institute. He thought that if the amendment were carried, and the Report were sent back, they would be taking the first step towards wrecking the Institute. He did not think sufficient had been said as to the point raised by Mr. Spiers, that the blackballing by the Institute was very different from the blackballing by the learned Societies. There was no obloquy in being blackballed in the Society of Antiquaries; it was a close corporation; they only received a limited number of Fellows. But if a man were blackballed by the Institute the stigma attached to him all through his life. If that man were giving evidence in a Court of Law he might be asked, "What is your status in the Royal Institute of British Architects?" "I am an Associate." "Have you ever tried to be a Fellow?" "Yes, I have." "And what happened?" "I was blackballed." And why? Because he did not happen to obtain the proportion of votes for election. That man's professional career would be interrupted and perhaps blasted. He trusted, therefore, that this clause would be adhered to by the Council. Another point; they all desired that their country brethren should come into the Institute and strengthen the hands of the representative body. The Council had been in communication with the non-Metropolitan Societies, and had prepared this Report to meet their views. He would appeal to Mr. Lanchester, and those who thought with him, to show their trust in the Council, to withdraw this amendment, and agree to the adjournment to the 14th June.

MR. W. H. SETH-SMITH [F.] heartily agreed with what had been said about the importance of maintaining the status of the Fellows. In speaking with provincial men who wanted to be Fellows he had urged certain points very forcibly. One was the examination which had been established for Fellows, which consisted of a very careful scrutiny of drawings of executed buildings. The cost of taking photographs of their executed works was so great that Associates could not very well face it; and there was some reason in that objection, because the cost of producing the necessary drawings was quite equivalent to the expense the Associates were put to in their examination. He hoped what had been said about having confidence in the Council would have weight; otherwise they would never get any forwarder. Business could never be got through without confidence in the Council. The Institute owed the Committee a great deal of gratitude for the way they had considered this subject. At the same time there were one or two points in the Report which he thought should be amended. If the adjournment were agreed to, one point should be considered in the interval, viz. whether it would be a safe thing to elect to the Fellowship without ballot the President or President-elect of any or all of the Allied Societies, because there were so many qualities and qualifications necessary in the President or President-elect of a provincial Society which would not constitute eligibility for the Institute.

A member having moved that the original motion should be now voted upon,

MR. ASTON WEBB [F.] asked the indulgence of the Meeting for saying a few words. The proposal before the Meeting at the present time was this: "That this Meet-

ing is of opinion, in consequence of the limited scope of the Reference to the Special Committee, that the adoption of the Council's Report would not be in the best interests of the Institute." Were members quite sure that they knew the reference to the Special Committee? Were they certain that it was not adequate; and were they at all sure that the Committee did not have all the facts before them? Because, if members were not sure, they could hardly wish to throw on the Committee all this labour without the opportunity of discussing it in any shape or form. The Meeting was debarred by the amendment from discussing it in detail, and it was sought to prevent that discussion by throwing the Report over. The reference to the Committee was a very wide one, and specified a great many points which were wished to be considered. The Committee was a large one, and composed of many gentlemen whose services the Institute ought to be glad to have, and who had attended and entered thoroughly into all the points. Mr. Owen Fleming said that the objectors to the Report did not wish to assume an attitude of opposition to the Committee. All that he asked was that they should have a little more discussion. The discussion that evening had done good and cleared the air. The Council knew a great deal more now what the Associates wished than they did before, and he appealed to them to let the Council have the next fortnight to consider the various points which had been very properly and fairly laid before them. If the Meeting adjourned to the 14th June they would have an opportunity meanwhile of thinking over the matter, and the Council would be treated more fairly than if the amendment were passed, which would prevent the present members of this Committee from acting again. They could hardly ask those distinguished members of the Committee to go through the whole mill again on a general resolution of this sort. It was the wish of all that the status of the Fellows should be raised. If members thought that the Report would lower the status of the Fellows, he could only say that the Committee took exactly the contrary view. Mr. Aston Webb further said that, in reply to Mr. Langston, he would undertake that the views of the objectors to the Report were properly laid before the Council before the next meeting, but not with a view to the Report's being referred back to the Council.

MR. E. W. MOUNTFORD [F.], in pressing the adjournment of the debate, said he was sure that the younger Associates would not attribute to him any want of sympathy with them, but they must see that snatching a chance division was hardly the way to treat so important a subject. He would advise them to meet the wishes of the Council to this extent, and allow the debate to be adjourned to this day fortnight. The Council, in whom they appeared to have so little confidence, had to meet and discuss these things over and over again, and members would not be giving up too much of their time if they gave two evenings to the subject instead of one. Again, if they objected to the Council it was very easy to elect a new one.

The motion for adjournment to the 14th June was then put from the Chair, and agreed to.

The Adjourned General Meeting for the further consideration of the Council's Report on the Fellows Question took place at the conclusion of the Business Meeting (Ordinary) of the 14th inst., Mr. Aston Webb, F.S.A., being in the Chair.

The Report as reconsidered by the Council was as follows:—

2. That the form of voting-papers be altered,

so that the names on the list voted against have to be crossed out.

3. That attention be called to the requirements of the Council as to the drawings, &c., to accompany an application for Fellowship.
4. That the Council consider it is desirable that Associates who are eligible should come forward for election as Fellows.
5. That when the Council of the Institute receive a unanimous recommendation formally submitted by the Council of any Allied Society that a practising member of the profession in their district is eligible and worthy of being elected a Fellow, the Council shall have the power to elect him, his work being of sufficient merit.
6. That power be given to the Council to admit annually to the Fellowship, without ballot, the President or President-elect of any or all of the Allied Societies who are eligible and apply for admission.
7. That the Council dispense with the payment of an entrance fee in the case of non-Metropolitan Fellows during the pleasure of the Council.
8. That a room be utilised as a tea and smoking room, and that no books from the Institute Library be consulted therein with the exception of periodicals and the professional journals.
9. That the Council consider it is desirable to hold periodical conferences, meetings, and dinners, a certain proportion thereof to take place in the provinces, with a view to promoting more friendly intercourse with the Allied Societies.
10. That the Allied Societies be invited to arrange, when possible, the date of election of their officers and the duration of their Sessions, so as to correspond with those of the Institute.

In the event of the foregoing Resolutions being approved, it will be necessary to alter certain By-laws, and the Council now propose the necessary alteration in those By-laws as follows:—

By-law 9. The following paragraph to be added thereto:—

Provided always that when the Council of the Institute receive a unanimous recommendation formally submitted by the Council of any Allied Society that a practising member of the profession in their district is eligible and worthy of being elected a Fellow, the Council shall have power to elect him, his work being of sufficient merit. The Council may also admit annually to the Fellowship, without ballot, the President or President-elect of any or all of the Allied Societies who may be eligible and apply for admission.

By-law 15, clause (a), to be added to as follows:—

Provided always that the Council may, during their pleasure, dispense with the payment of an entrance fee in the case of non-Metropolitan Fellows.

THE CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said that under the ordinary rules of debate the meeting was in the hands of the gentleman who had moved the adjournment at the last meeting; but he had his consent to intervene with a statement showing how the report came to be brought before the Institute, and giving the result of a special Council Meeting held last Friday to consider the views expressed by speakers at the last meeting. In the autumn of 1895, Mr. Penrose drew attention in his Presidential Address to the falling-off of candidates for the Fellowship. In the five years 1891 to 1895 the elections to the class of Fellows were as follows:—

Year	Number elected
1891	63
1892	59
1893	24
1894	10
1895	9

In December 1895 a Committee was appointed by the Council to inquire into the reasons for this gradual diminution of Fellows. Almost simultaneously with the appointment of that Committee a memorial was received, signed by the President of the Institute, by four members of the Council, by a considerable number of Fellows, and by a very large number of Associates. That Memorial was as follows:—

We, the undersigned, members of the Royal Institute of British Architects, observe with regret that there is a growing difficulty in obtaining proposals for admission to the class of Fellows from candidates who are in every way eligible. We believe, moreover, that the uncertainty of recent elections and the dearth of eligible candidates may be ascribed to the differences of opinion which exist as to the qualifications for Fellowship. We would therefore respectfully urge upon the Council the immediate necessity of definitely regulating the future election of Fellows under the powers conferred by clause 3 of the Charter, upon the principle that Fellows should be elected solely from the class of Associates, excepting only in the case of those architects whose work is of recognised merit.

He had been told that there was an impression abroad that the Memorial did not receive the attention it deserved. The President of the Institute, however, who signed that Memorial, was also Chairman of the Fellows Committee, and attended most regularly to his duties. That sufficed to show that the Memorial had not been overlooked, though it was not necessary to refer to it specially in the Report. The Committee met three times, and reported to the Council, in May 1896, on two points. The Council considered that Report, and then requested the Committee to consider the matter still further, widening the reference so as to include the whole question of the admission of Fellows. At the same time several gentlemen, including the two Associate members of the Council, were added to the Committee, so as to include as far as possible all branches of thought. Two more meetings were held, and the conclusions arrived at—practically the first four Resolutions of the present Report—were laid before a Special Meeting of the Institute held on the 6th July last year,* in order to hear the views of the General Body. So far as he remembered, there was then no opposition to those proposals. The Council therefore

* JOURNAL, Vol. III. Third Series, p. 521.

proceeded on the lines of those four heads, but postponed their final Report until they had still further consulted the Allied Societies. As a matter of fact, the principal additions to the present Report were the result of conferences with the Allied Societies. The Committee met again in November and in January, and drew up various resolutions and proposals which were submitted to the Allied Societies. A meeting was ultimately held, at which there was a good attendance of gentlemen from the Allied Societies, while those who could not come had held special meetings, and sent up printed reports containing their views on the various proposals; the result being that on 19th January of the present year a Report was made to the Council, substantially in the form now before the Meeting. He had thought it necessary to give this little historical sketch, as many gentlemen had little idea of the amount of work that had been done and the questions that had been raised; he assured them that every point raised at the Meeting a fortnight ago had been discussed over and over again at those Committee meetings. Coming down to the present time, the Council had taken into consideration all the points raised at the last meeting, and the Council desired, to meet those views, to modify their Report as far as possible. Clauses Nos. 1 and 2 it was necessary to take together. Every one was unanimously in favour of No. 2. It was obviously fair that the man who wished to keep any one out of the Institute should have the unpleasant duty of putting his pen through his name; therefore they proposed to keep that. But as to question No. 1 there seemed a strong feeling that it would lower the dignity of the Fellowship if they reduced the number of black balls to keep a man out; and as an alteration of a by-law should only be made if there is urgent demand for it, the Council proposed to withdraw No. 1 altogether. With regard to No. 3: "That attention be called to the requirements of the Council as to the drawings, &c., to accompany an application for Fellowship," that was merely a matter for the Council. It concerned the examination of Fellows; but, in order that it should be a fair and proper examination of Fellows, the Council desired that it should be fully stated, and perhaps a little more generally known, what that examination consisted of. Mr. Macvicar Anderson, when he was President, put the whole of this question in a nutshell when he said that Associates should be examined as students, but that Fellows should be examined as architects. The Testimony of Study is for Associates, and assuming that a man is an honourable and an upright man, the only other test is the test of his work. With regard to No. 4, it had always been felt that there was a large number of Associates who, in duty to themselves and in duty to the Institute, ought to become Fellows. So it was proposed to send a notice round reminding them of that fact. But there seemed to be great objection to such a course. It was thought that it might be misunderstood, and taken as an invitation, and that it would be very hard, when a man had been invited to become a Fellow, not to elect him; therefore it was proposed to omit a portion of the resolution so that it should read as follows: "That the Council consider it desirable that Associates who are eligible should come forward for election as Fellows." No. 5 affected a question that was brought in entirely after the last report, and in accordance with the views of the Allied Societies. Every one, he was sure, laid great stress upon the importance of the Allied Societies, and upon having a large number of members of the Institute in all parts of the country. The Councils of the provincial Societies nearly all suggested some proposal of this sort, that when a man was sufficiently well known and respected in his own district to be unanimously recommended by his Society, the Council of the Institute should be trusted to elect him after putting him through the usual examination that candidates for Fellowship are subjected to. The

necessity for doing something of the sort might be shown by giving one or two figures. At Sheffield, there were 67 members, only ten of whom belonged to the Institute; at Leicester there were 58 members, only 18 of whom belonged to the Institute; at Liverpool there were 78, only 25 of whom belonged to the Institute; and so in other centres. Surely there must be one or two in each of those Societies who would be well worthy of being elected Fellows. The Council were of opinion that the governing bodies of the provincial Societies should be able from time to time to nominate such men as they desired. The Council felt that they ought to concede this point to the Allied Societies; but to make the matter quite clear they proposed to add to that recommendation the following words: "his work being of sufficient merit." He hoped that would meet the views of those who objected to the clause as originally drafted. No. 6 was very much the same as No. 5, and nothing need be said on that. With regard to No. 7, provincial members thought that as they had not the same advantages as London members, they ought to be exempt from payment of an entrance fee. Taking into account the fact that the Associates' entrance fee was practically their examination fee, the Council thought they might fairly give provincial Fellows that little advantage, and take off the entrance fee. Then there was a little verbal correction. Instead of saying, "That it be recommended to the Council," it was proposed to say "That the Council dispense with." With regard to No. 8, instead of saying, "The old Council Room," it was proposed merely to say, "That a room be used." The Council hoped to find a room to be used as a sort of common room for smoking, without utilising the old Council Room at all. The country members had said that it would be a great convenience to them when they came to town if they could see a client or others they had business with at the Institute rooms, and this proposal was to meet their request. With regard to No. 9, the meeting at Manchester last year was immensely appreciated by the provincial members, and if they could arrange occasionally to hold their dinner in the provinces, the good feeling between London and the provincial architects would be much increased, and be a mutual advantage; that was therefore a reasonable and proper suggestion. With regard to No. 10, that was purely an executive matter. The Presidents of Allied Societies had to be put into the Institute balloting list, and it often happened that an Allied Society did not know who their President would be until after the Institute list had been issued. It would be convenient, therefore, if the provincial Societies could hold their elections a little earlier, so that the names of Presidents might be known in time for the Institute list. That covered all the points generally. The best way of discussing the Report fairly, and of coming to a conclusion, as he hoped they should that evening, would be to postpone for a time the motion for the adoption of the Report, and to take it clause by clause; and when they had been all through it, then to bring forward the original motion. Mr. Lanchester could then, if he chose, bring forward his amendment. He thought, however, that the Council's amendments had met most of his objections.

Mr. H. VAUGHAN LANCHESTER [A.] expressed himself willing to withdraw his amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN then put No. 2, which was carried unanimously.

With regard to No. 3, Mr. G. A. T. Middleton [A.] asked whether care would be taken to ascertain whether the drawings had been actually supervised by the candidate. The Chairman replied that candidates were always asked if it was their own design. The drawing was not the important part of it, but the design. No. 3 was then put and carried unanimously.

THE CHAIRMAN then put No. 4, stating that it would then merely be an expression of this Meeting through their Council that it was desirable, when an Associate was

eligible for a Fellow—eligible, that is to say, if he had done sufficient work, and in other ways—he should come forward as a Fellow. No. 4 was carried unanimously.

THE CHAIRMAN then put No. 5, reading the amended version at the request of Mr. H. Langston, "That when the Council of the Institute receive a unanimous recommendation, formally submitted by the Council of any Allied Society, that a practising member of the profession in their district is eligible and worthy of being elected a Fellow, the Council shall have the power to elect him, his work being of sufficient merit."

Mr. JOHN SLATER [F.], in proposing that the resolution be adopted, urged that if the Council of an Allied Society were unanimous in recommending to the Council any architect in their neighbourhood the option of electing him was a very little thing to be given to the Council, and that it would be a slur upon them if that amount of freedom were not given. It would further be a very disagreeable slap in the face to the members of the Allied Societies if this Meeting were to reject this proposal. The feeling was unanimous in the provinces that some such regulation as this ought to exist. He begged formally to move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. PENROSE [F.], F.R.S., in seconding the resolution, vouched for the great interest that members of the Allied Societies had taken in the clause.

Mr. MACVICAR ANDERSON [F.], rising in support of the resolution, stated that he regarded this as the one of the ten points that ought to be carried without any discussion or doubt or hesitation. A new policy had been inaugurated in the Institute of late years. The Council had endeavoured to extend the influence of the Institute to the provinces as far as possible and so had created the Allied Societies of the Institute. It was surely desirable to bring in as many members of the Allied Societies as members of the Institute as possible; and, what was of infinitely greater importance, carrying this resolution would show the provincial members throughout the provinces that the Institute had confidence in them. By withdrawing the first of these rules it was shown that the Council had confidence in the Associates. In regard to this clause he asked the Associates to have the same confidence in country members. By adopting this clause, the Meeting would give very great satisfaction to country members, and at the same time greatly strengthen the hands of the Institute.

Mr. LANGSTON [A.] argued that he had not heard one argument advanced by any member of the Council why the Council should have the exclusive privilege of electing these gentlemen from the country.

Mr. WILLIAM WHITE [F.], F.S.A., in reply to the last speaker, urged that it was a mistake to admit Associates to the organic government of the Institute, maintaining that the Council was the proper body to receive the communication from the Allied Societies and to act upon it.

Mr. BERESFORD PITE [F.] pointed out that the object of any method of election was to exclude the undesirable candidates; and the fact whether a man was undesirable or not must go with knowledge; and it was clearly desirable that those should have the right or the power of exercising this excluding measure who have that knowledge. Therefore, if the Council of an Allied Society unanimously recommend a member to the Council of the Royal Institute, the man's undesirability or desirability is tested by those who have the knowledge. Also, that inasmuch as the Associates have been trusted and empowered to vote in elections quite recently, as part of a policy which is to extend the influence of the Institute, it would be very undesirable that the newly constituted body of electors should at the outset exercise their authority by limiting the influence and the extent of this Institute.

Mr. OWEN FLEMING [A.], in venturing to differ from

the views of supporters of the resolution, felt that he was, perhaps, taking a wider view of the Institute and its members. He urged that it would be a courteous action for the Council not to press the motion, and more than courteous—statesmanlike; because, supposing the members of the Allied Societies were elected by the unanimous vote of the Institute, surely it was a little higher honour than even being elected by a Council. It prevented Associates from doing that honour to their provincial brethren that they would desire to do.

THE HON. SECRETARY pointed out that it was a greater honour for a member of a Society to be elected by the Council than to come in by ballot.

Mr. H. HEATHCOTE STATHAM [F.], in support of the clause, said that it was important that the Allied Societies should be drawn into the Institute. It was not a way to draw the Societies to say to them, "You must submit your candidate to the vote of the Institute, most of whom know nothing about him." It was only a proper thing that weight should be attached to the unanimous recommendation, and regard it as coming from people who knew their men, and whose opinion was to be accepted.

Mr. E. W. HUDSON [A.] opposed the resolution, on the ground that members of the Allied Societies would unanimously recommend each other, and instanced occasions on which Associates made a right use of their votes.

Mr. C. H. BRODIE [A.] maintained that candidates for election should come before the whole body. He also believed that a great mistake had been made in altering the by-laws to make some variation in the method of election, and did not want that mistake repeated.

Mr. EDWIN T. HALL [F.] stated that there was no want of confidence in the Associates. Ten years ago, when the Charter was under discussion, he was one of the strongest advocates for voting by the Associates on every matter in the Institute, but it was a liberal extension of that confidence which had caused the Council to bring this proposal forward. In the Charter it was in contemplation that there should be branches of the Royal Institute all over the country, and, if there had been, it would be almost certain that those branches would have the power of electing members of the Institute—a view which was very strongly impressed upon the Committee when this subject was under discussion. The Allied Societies say that many of their members are nervous of being rejected—they do not know whether they may or may not be. Of course, in the ballot, it follows very frequently that a man may be rejected, and they say that in a small provincial town to be rejected is practically death to that man's professional work; therefore they say if their Council unanimously say he is a fit and proper person, he ought to be free from that grave danger. It was for that reason that the Committee and the Council strongly thought the resolution should be recommended to the Institute and adopted by it. When a recommended candidate comes before the Council, his drawings would come up like those of every other member. The drawings have to be examined, and he has to make a declaration that the designs are his own; and when they have passed the Council, the Council say he is a fit and proper person. It was simply then an act of courtesy to the local Society, and would add to their prestige in their district as architects, and therefore to the prestige of the Royal Institute of British Architects with whom they were allied.

Mr. ROBERT WILLIAMS [F.] considered the proposal a dangerous one.

Mr. FRANK LISHMAN [A.], speaking on behalf of the Allied Societies, thought that there was much good in this fifth clause, but there was a very serious loophole for escape for Associates. The result of this clause would, in all probability, be a falling-off from the provincial centres of the Associates, for men would wait until the time came when they could be unanimously recommended for Fellowship.

Mr. E. W. MOUNTFORD [F.] considered the point altogether misunderstood. It was not a question of confidence between them and the Council, but it was the desire of the Council to confer a certain amount of honour upon the provincial Societies. The provincial Societies asked for a right to elect Fellows direct, without any vote of the Council, and it was with some trouble that they were prevailed upon to accept this modification of their desires. To reject the Report would be to offend nine-tenths of the provincial members. It was a question of whether we should give their Council a privilege of certain gentlemen being elected without going through the ordeal by ballot—that was all the point. To refute the arguments of the last speaker, he considered the unanimous vote of a provincial Council would be a very rare thing. And, further, when the Council here reserved the right to sit in judgment upon the work of a member so recommended, that of itself would be a sufficient guarantee that justice would be done to the selection of the provincial Societies who had recommended him to the Council of the Institute.

THE CHAIRMAN, before putting the matter to the vote, reminded Associates that under clause 28 of the Charter they could not vote on this point, as it involved the alteration of a by-law. If, however, when the Report was put as a whole, they objected to any part of it, Associates could then exercise their right of voting against its adoption.

Mr. LANGSTON [A.] protested that there was nothing in the resolution about a "by-law," and that the Associates had a constitutional right to vote upon the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN regretted that he could put no other construction on the clause of the Charter. He had no option, therefore, but to ask Fellows alone to vote on this Resolution.

Resolution 5 was then put from the Chair, and carried, 22 Fellows voting for and 1 against it. Resolutions 6 and 7 were also voted on by Fellows alone, and carried unanimously. Resolution 8, voted on by both classes, was carried with one dissident.

Resolution 9 being before the Meeting, Mr. Langston objected to the postponement of the Annual Dinner, originally fixed to take place in June, observing that it was most desirable that the function should have been held during the Jubilee celebrations, when members from the provinces and abroad would be in London. A valuable opportunity of reunion with their provincial and colonial brethren had thus been lost.

THE HON. SECRETARY explained that the proposal with regard to the Dinner had been carefully considered by the Council, but there were various reasons for postponing it. In the first place, they had a difficulty in securing a room for the purpose, only three days being open to them in the whole of the summer. Again, though notices had gone out to members some six weeks or more before the postponement was decided on, only some six or eight applications had been received for tickets. Then something like fifty invitations had been issued to distinguished persons to attend the Dinner, but every one of those persons was engaged in consequence of the Dinner having to be held in one particular week. The Dinner would be held later in the year, and members would receive notices in due course.—Resolutions 9 and 10 were thereupon separately put and carried unanimously.

THE CHAIRMAN, in moving the adoption of the Report as it had been amended and altered, observed that several of the Associates had expressed an opinion that the views of those who differed from the previous Report had been met in a conciliatory and large spirit. There appeared to be only one point of difference which the Council had not seen their way to grant. It was impossible, in a meeting of gentlemen holding various views, to arrange any Report which should really meet everybody on every single point. The Council had met the objectors on every point but this one, and he asked them to meet the Council on

that, which was really a small point after all. He did not believe that that clause would be a great deal used, but to show the confidence in, and the anxiety they had to keep the Allied Societies with, them he would ask them to agree to the one point which the Council had not been able to concede.

Mr. J. M. BRYDON [F.] seconded the motion. With regard to Resolution No. 5, it must be remembered that the election rested with the Council after all, however unanimously a gentleman had been recommended by the Allied Society. Words had been added to the resolution making the quality of the candidates' work the supreme test. Now surely members did not want anything stronger than that. He should like to read to the Meeting the actual regulation referred to in that clause, as he believed it was not very well known. It ran: "Every person desiring to be admitted a Fellow shall in all cases submit for examination by the Council, as evidence of his abilities as a practising architect, working drawings, and, if practical, photographs of his executed works, with such further evidence, if any, as the Council may require. Such drawings and photographs shall be accompanied by a declaration, signed by the applicant, that the buildings to which they relate have been designed by himself." That was not a question of drawing, but of design. If a man had sent a declaration, signed by himself, that the designs of the buildings were his own, and if the Council, after having sat on those designs, were unanimously of opinion that he had done work of such quality as to be admitted a Fellow, surely that was test enough for any man.

Mr. SYDNEY B. BEALE [A.] said that the Associates had to take a certain line on this occasion. It was useless for them to discuss the question, as they were not allowed to vote upon it. A great deal might have been said to upset the fears of Mr. Hall and the arguments of Mr. Slater, and he had hoped to have had the opportunity of combating some of the arguments in the Chairman's opening remarks, but he was denied that opportunity in consequence of being disfranchised. The Associates therefore proposed to show that they disagreed with the Chairman's ruling on that point by voting against the adoption of the whole of the Report.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it was very far from their wish to close the mouths of any of the Associates, and they would relax any order there might be in order to have a clear expression of opinion from everybody.

Mr. E. W. HUDSON [A.] said that it seemed to him that the provincial branches approached the Council in the spirit of putting a pistol to their heads, and stating their demands, threatening, as it were, to secede if they did not get what they asked. That was not the spirit in which a foster-child should come to his parent. For that reason he regretted that he should not be able to support the motion.

Mr. VAUGHAN LANCHESTER [A.] thought that clause 5 was the only one on which there was any question. An idea seemed to prevail that Associates sought to keep out all the Fellows, or the great bulk of them, who did not come through the Associate class. That clause was purely the result of that idea. There was not the slightest desire in any member to keep out a man who could reasonably be considered a desirable Fellow; and it was most unwise to propose that the voting power should be restricted. The idea would obtain currency in the provinces that a large body of the Institute would vote against every man who was not what they considered the *beau idéal* of a Fellow, that they would, out of petty cliqueism or spite, blackball an eligible country candidate. It would be a grave mistake to pass such a clause as No. 5. The Report with that clause left out would be quite sufficient to meet all difficulties. He could not conscientiously vote for the adoption of the Report with clause 5 in it.

Mr. MACVICAR ANDERSON [F.] pointed out that they could conscientiously vote upon it, as the clause was pro-

posed as an honour to express confidence in their country members. One other point: he had been present at every one of the meetings, and he should like to point out that the representatives of the Allied Societies who attended the meetings exhibited the utmost possible courtesy, and certainly did not exhibit any spirit which could be properly described as "putting a pistol to the Council's head"—quite the reverse.

Mr. W. D. CARÖE [F.], F.S.A., said that the provincial bodies did not offer their views unasked; they were applied to by the Council in the first instance. One of the main points upon which they were all agreed was the one embodied in Resolution No. 5, and that was the one honour the Council proposed to do them. It was a misunderstanding on the part of the Associates to think that this clause was directed against them.

Mr. E. T. HALL [F.] pointed out that the Report was a compromise after conference with all the Allied Societies. They had asked for a great deal more than there was in this Report, but this one point had been left in their interests.

THE CHAIRMAN understood from Mr. Lanchester, who, he believed, was speaking on behalf of a considerable number of Associates, that the only objection taken to the Report was to Clause 5. He appealed to them, was it not a great pity to lose the labour of nearly two years on account of one point? He proposed, then, to make a suggestion, which would possibly get over the difficulty, and enable the Meeting generally to pass the Report. He would suggest that this Clause No. 5 be limited for a period of five years. His reason for suggesting the alteration was this: The Associates or the Memorialists were anxious—and he quite appreciated their point—that Fellows should in future come in through the class of Associates. But for some years there must be a certain number of gentlemen of an age who could not be asked to undergo an examination, but whose work at the same time entitled them to become Fellows if they were approached in the way suggested. He trusted his proposal would meet the views of the Associates.

The motion for the adoption of the Report, as modified, was then put, and carried by a majority of nineteen, forty-four voting in favour and twenty-five against.

The Resolutions for the alteration of the by-laws were then put, and carried unanimously, Fellows only voting.

Mr. SETH-SMITH [F.] asked leave to move that the following Resolution be added to the Report:—"That this Institute desires to emphasise the fact that, while it regards the qualification for the Associateship as a sufficient guarantee of a proper training, the Fellowship must be understood to be its diploma and the complete qualification of an architect." The words which dropped from the Chairman in his opening remarks showed that he approved of this proposition, which would focus what had already been passed. The "Associateship" was a sufficient guarantee of a proper training, but the Fellowship must be looked to to be the Institute's complete diploma. There was a very hazy idea as to this, and there would be a clearer distinction between the two classes if that were understood—it would do more than anything else to promote the candidature for the Fellowship.

Mr. Seth-Smith's motion not being seconded, the matter dropped.

MINUTES. XV.

SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.

THE FELLOWS QUESTION.

At a Special General Meeting, held Monday, 31st May 1897, at 8 p.m., Professor Aitchison, A.R.A., President, in the Chair, the Minutes of the Meeting held 17th May 1897 [p. 368] were taken as read and signed as correct.

The Secretary announced the decease of Charles John

Phipps, Fellow; George Orrell, Associate; and John Jenkins Cole, formerly a Fellow of the Institute.

The following Associates attending for the first time since their election were formally admitted and signed the Register—viz. George John Thrift Reavell, Stephen Powlson Rees, and Philip Appleby Robson.

The Report of the Council on the Election of Candidates for Fellowship [see p. 385], a copy of which had been issued to every home member of the Institute, was formally presented by the President and taken as read.

The Secretary having replied to questions, of which notice had been given by Mr. H. Hardwicke Langston [A.], respecting the composition of the Fellows Special Committee, the number of meetings held, and the attendances of each member, the adoption of the Report was moved by Mr. John Slater [F.] and seconded by Mr. Aston Webb, Vice-President.

An amendment, moved by Mr. H. Hardwicke Langston [A.] and seconded by Mr. H. Jones Lanchester [A.], that it was inexpedient to confer upon the Council the powers proposed in the Report, was withdrawn in favour of an amendment, moved by Mr. H. Vaughan Lanchester [A.] and seconded by Mr. Sydney B. Beale [A.], that in consequence of the limited scope of the reference to the Committee the adoption of the Report would be prejudicial to the interests of the Institute, and that the Report be referred back in order that the state of the Institute and its members might be more fully considered.

After considerable discussion, the adjournment of the Meeting was moved by Mr. Wm. Woodward [A.] and seconded by Mr. R. Phené Spiers [F.]; but being lost upon a show of hands, a further discussion ensued, and it was ultimately agreed that the Meeting should be adjourned to Monday the 14th June, after the conclusion of the Business Meeting (Ordinary) summoned for that evening, it being understood that the views of members who supported Mr. Lanchester's amendment would be considered by the Council in the interim.

The proceedings then closed, and the Meeting separated at 10.40 p.m.

BUSINESS GENERAL MEETING.

At the Fifteenth General Meeting (Business) of the Session, held Monday, 14th June 1897, at 8 p.m., Mr. Aston Webb, F.S.A., Vice-President, in the Chair, the following members attending for the first time since their election were formally admitted and signed the respective registers, namely, Arthur Thomas Walmisley, Hon. Associate; and Everard Eastee Jordan and George Fox, Associates.

The Hon. Secretary announced the receipt of donations to the Library [see Supplement], and an expression of thanks to the several donors was ordered to be entered on the Minutes.

The Chairman read the Reports of the Scrutineers appointed by the Annual General Meeting [p. 344] to conduct the election of the Council and Standing Committees.* The following were declared to be the results:—

THE COUNCIL.

PRESIDENT.—Professor Aitchison, A.R.A. [unopposed].

VICE-PRESIDENTS (4).—William Milner Fawcett; Henry Louis Florence; Ernest George; Edward Augustus Gruning [unopposed].

HON. SECRETARY.—William Emerson [unopposed].

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL (18).—Aston Webb, 408 votes; James Brooks, 324; John Alfred Gotch, 370; John McKean Brydon, 366; Edward William Mountford, 363

* The Scrutineers were Messrs. A. H. Kersey, John Norton, John S. Quilter, Hugh Stannus, and Frederick Todd, *Fellows*; R. Shekleton Balfour, Ernest R. Barrow, Sydney W. Cranfield, and H. Hardwicke Langston, *Associates*. The Report states that 496 Papers were received, and that 31 were set aside for informality.

John Belcher, 344; Alexander Graham, 336; Richard Phené Spiers, 332; William Douglas Caröe, 331; Henry Heathcote Statham, 324; John Slater, 321; Paul Waterhouse, 321; Charles Hadfield, 306; Thomas Blashill, 301; Campbell Douglas, 294; Ralph Selden Wornum, 291; Thomas William Cutler, 283; Benjamin Ingelow, 280. Not elected: *William Young*, 273 votes; *Edwin Thomas Hall*, 272; *Keith Downes Young*, 267; *Joseph Oswald*, 257; *George Henry Bibby*, 196; *Delissa Joseph*, 170.

ASSOCIATE-MEMBERS OF COUNCIL (2).—Arthur Smyth Flower, 327 votes; Edward Guy Dawber, 301. Not elected: *James Sivewright Gibson*, 251 votes.

REPRESENTATIVES OF ALLIED SOCIETIES (8).—William Larkins Bernard (Bristol Society of Architects); Albert Nelson Bromley (Nottingham Architectural Society); Thomas Drew (Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland); John Ely (Manchester Society of Architects); Leslie Ower (Dundee Institute of Architecture); Henry Perkin (York Architectural Society); Arnold Thorne (Devon and Exeter Architectural Society); Edwin Montgomery Bruce Vaughan (Cardiff, South Wales, and Monmouthshire Architects Society) [unopposed].

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION (LONDON).—Hampton William Pratt [unopposed].

[The above members declared to have been duly elected compose the Council.]

AUDITORS.—Edmund Woodthorpe, *Fellow*; Owen Fleming, *Associate* [unopposed].

THE STANDING COMMITTEES.

Art Standing Committee.

FELLOWS (10).—Ernest George, 427; James Brooks, 399; Alfred Waterhouse, 393; John McKean Brydon, 392; John Belcher, 387; Edward Mountford, 387; Beresford Pite, 375; John Macvicar Anderson, 370; William Douglas Caröe, 353; William Young, 303. Not elected:—*William Samuel Weatherley*, 282.

ASSOCIATES (6).—Robert Shekleton Balfour, 369; Henry Thomas Hare, 359; Edward Guy Dawber, 357; James Sivewright Gibson, 325; John William Simpson, 303; Owen Fleming, 278. Not elected:—*William Henry Romaine-Walker*, 267; *William Arthur Webb*, 246.

Literature Standing Committee.

FELLOWS (10).—Richard Phené Spiers, 363; Alexander Graham, 365; William Alfred Pite, 356; Paul Waterhouse, 354; Benjamin Ingelow, 331; Henry Louis Florence, 327; Charles Harrison Townsend, 319; Sydney Smirke, 302; John Tavenor Perry, 293; William Frederick Unsworth, 269. Not elected:—*Francis Edward Caves*, 242; *George Henry Bibby*, 238; *John Hebb*, 220.

ASSOCIATES (6).—Andrew Noble Prentice, 384; Percy Scott Worthington, 378; Arthur Smyth Flower, 365; P. Leslie Waterhouse, 356; Ravenscroft Elsey Smith, 342; Arthur Thomas Bolton, 322. Not elected:—*Banister Flight Fletcher*, 253.

Practice Standing Committee.

FELLOWS (10).—Samuel Flint Clarkson, 376; Joseph Douglass Mathews, 370; Walter Hilton Nas's, 365; Thomas Batterbury, 362; Lacy William Ridge, 359; Edwin Thomas Hall, 358; Edmund Woodthorpe, 351; Alexander Henry Kersey, 341; Henry Cowell Boyes, 331; Thomas Harris, 314. Not elected:—*James Osborne Smith*, 302.

ASSOCIATES (6).—Henry Thomas Hare, 339; W. H. Atkin Berry, 332; Francis Thomas Wilberforce Goldsmith, 312; Augustus William Tanner, 297; Frederick Henry Appleton Hardecastle, 283; George Richards Julian, 283. Not elected:—*Robert Stark Wilkinson*, 273; *Thomas Edward Mundy*, 263.

Science Standing Committee.

FELLOWS (10).—Percival Gordon Smith, 390; William Howard Seth-Smith, 388; Lewis Angell, 381; William Charles Street, 380; Keith Downes Young, 380; Her-

bert Duncan Searles-Wood, 376; Frederic Richard Farrow, 372; John Salmon Quilter, 356; Benjamin Taberner, 326; Lewis Solomon, 321. Not elected:—*Delissa Joseph*, 233.

ASSOCIATES (6).—Robert Langton Cole, 434; Henry William Burrows, 419; Max Clarke, 406; Matthew Garbutt, 402; George Pearson, 401; Bernard John Dicksee, 391.

On the motion of the Chairman, a cordial vote of thanks was passed to the Scrutinizers for their services in conducting the elections.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS.

The following candidates for membership were elected by show of hands, under By-law 9, namely:—

As Fellows (4).

EDWARD ALBERT RAM (Hong Kong).

STANLEY PERCY SILCOCK [A.] *Qualified as Associate* 1888 (Warrington).

GEORGE ELEY HALLIDAY (Cardiff).

FRANCIS GEORGE FIELDER HOOPER [A.], *Qualified as Associate* 1882, *Pugin Student* 1882, *Goldwin Bursar* 1888.

As Associates (5).

EDWARD ALBERT JOLLYE [Qualified 1888].

EDWARD HARDING PAYNE [Qualified 1896].

EDWIN NICHOLSON [Probationer 1890, Student 1892, Qualified 1895].

JAMES SAUNDERS [Qualified 1892] (Oldham).

HUGH THOMAS PORTER [Qualified 1896].

As Hon. Associates (3).

HENRY WILLIAM BREWER.

J. LEWIS THOMAS.

SIR JAMES DROGMORE LINTON, President of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours.

As Hon. Corr. Members (3).

JEAN JACQUES WINDERS (Antwerp).

ALEXANDRE CHARLES ARTHUR, COMTE DE MARSY (Compiègne, France).

JEAN THÉOPHILE HOMOLLE (Paris).

The Meeting then terminated.

ADJOURNED SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.

THE FELLOWS QUESTION.

At the Adjourned Special General Meeting, held Monday, 14th June 1897, at 8 p.m., Mr. Aston Webb, F.S.A., *Vice-President*, in the Chair, the Minutes of the Meeting held 31st May 1897 [p. 394] were read and signed as correct.

The Chairman opened the proceedings with a statement detailing the reasons for the appointment of the Fellows Committee, briefly sketched the proceedings at the meetings of the Committee and the conferences with Allied Societies, and concluded with a description of the modifications introduced into the Report by the Council in deference to the views expressed by members at the meeting of the 31st ult.

Mr. H. Vaughan Lanchester [A.] having withdrawn the amendment moved by him at the last Meeting, that the Report be referred back to the Council, the various clauses of the Report were discussed *seriatim*, with the result that it was

RESOLVED, That the form of voting-papers be altered, so that the names on the list voted against have to be crossed out.

It was further

RESOLVED, That attention be called to the requirements of the Council as to the drawings, &c., to accompany an application for Fellowship.

It was further

RESOLVED, That it is desirable that Associates who are eligible should come forward for election as Fellows.

It was further

RESOLVED, That when the Council of the Institute receive a unanimous recommendation formally submitted by the Council of any Allied Society that a practising member of the profession in their district is eligible and worthy of being elected a Fellow, the Council shall have the power to elect him, his work being of sufficient merit. [See addendum to this Resolution below.]

On this and the two following Resolutions, the Chairman ruled that, under the terms of the Charter, Associates were debarred from voting: the vote therefore was restricted to Fellows.

It was further

RESOLVED, That power be given to the Council to admit annually to the Fellowship, without ballot, the President or President-elect of any or all of the Allied Societies who are eligible and apply for admission.

It was further

RESOLVED, That the Council dispense with the payment of an entrance fee in the case of non-Metropolitan Fellows during the pleasure of the Council.

It was further

RESOLVED, That a room be utilised as a tea and smoking room, and that no books from the Institute Library be consulted therein with the exception of periodicals and the professional journals.

It was further

RESOLVED, That it is desirable to hold periodical conferences, meetings, and dinners, a certain proportion thereof to take place in the provinces, with a view to promoting more friendly intercourse with the Allied Societies.

It was further

RESOLVED, That the Allied Societies be invited to arrange, when possible, the date of election of their officers and the duration of their Sessions, so as to correspond with those of the Institute.

The Chairman, having moved the adoption of the Report as altered and amended, and a section of the Meeting being opposed to the passing of the Resolution numbered 5 in the Report (fourth on the amended list set out above), suggested the limitation of the power to elect conferred on the Council by that clause to a period of five years. The clause was then added to as follows: "And further that the operation of the By-law embodying this Resolution be limited to a term of five years." The Report was then put as a whole, and carried by forty-four votes to twenty-five.

The alterations in the By-laws required to carry out the Resolutions arrived at were hereupon put to the Meeting, and it was

RESOLVED, That the following paragraph be added to By-law 9:—

Provided always that when the Council of the Institute receive a unanimous recommendation formally submitted by the Council of any Allied Society that a practising member of the profession in their district is eligible and worthy of being elected a Fellow, the Council shall have power to elect him, his work being of sufficient merit, and that the operation of this provision be limited to a term of five years. The Council may also admit annually to the Fellowship, without ballot, the President or President-elect of any or all of the Allied Societies who may be eligible and apply for admission.

It was further

RESOLVED, That clause (a), By-law 15, be added to as follows:—

Provided always that the Council may, during their pleasure, dispense with the payment of an entrance fee in the case of non-Metropolitan Fellows.

A motion by Mr. Seth-Smith, that a further Resolution [see p. 394] be added to the Report, not being seconded, was dropped.

The proceedings then closed, and the Meeting separated at 10.30 p.m.

ALLIED SOCIETIES.

OFFICERS AND COUNCILS 1897-1898.

The Leicester Society.

President, Mr. Charles Baker; Council, Messrs. J. Goodacre [F.], A. H. Paget [F.], A. E. Sawday [F.], T. H. Fosbrooke, H. L. Goddard [A.], and H. H. Thomson [A.]; Hon. Treasurer, Mr. Stockdale Harrison [F.]; Hon. Secretary, Mr. S. Perkins Pick [A.].

The Manchester Society.

President, Mr. John Ely [F.]; Vice-Presidents, Messrs. R. I. Bennett [F.] and J. H. Woodhouse [F.]; Hon. Secretary and Treasurer, Paul Ogden [F.]; Assistant Hon. Secretary, Mr. Edward Hewitt [F.]; Members of Council, Messrs. T. Chadwick [A.], A. H. Davies-Colley [A.], Charles Heathcote [F.], John Holden [F.], R. Knill Freeman [F.], F. W. Mee [F.], J. D. Mould [A.], W. A. Royle [F.], Edward Salomons [F.], J. S. Hodgson, H. E. Stelfox [A.], and P. S. Worthington [A.].

The Northern Association.

President, Mr. F. W. Rich; Vice-President, Mr. W. Glover; Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. T. Cackett [F.]; Hon. Secretary, Mr. A. B. Plummer [F.]; Hon. Solicitor, Mr. H. C. Harvey; Hon. Librarian, Mr. H. C. Charlewood [A.]; Council, Messrs. G. T. Brown (Hon. Local Secretary for Sunderland), A. M. Dunn, R. B. Dick, C. S. Errington [A.], W. S. Hicks, R. J. Leeson, C.C., J. H. Morton [F.] (Hon. Local Secretary for S. Shields), J. Oswald [F.], T. Reay and J. W. Taylor [F.]; Hon. Auditors, Messrs. J. W. Donald [A.] and W. E. Fenwicke.

The Nottingham Society.

President, Mr. A. N. Bromley [F.]; Vice-President, Mr. A. H. Goodall; Council, Messrs. W. A. Heazell [F.], H. Walker [F.], Arthur Marshall [A.], A. Ernest Heazell, and J. Sander; Auditors, Messrs. A. W. Brewill [F.] and J. Sander; Hon. Secretary and Treasurer, Mr. Robert Evans, jun.

The Sheffield Society.

President, Mr. R. W. Fowler; Vice-President, Mr. Joseph Smith; Treasurer, Mr. F. Fowler; Hon. Secretary, Mr. C. J. Innocent [F.]; Council, Messrs. A. Smith Denton, H. W. Lockwood, W. F. Hemsoll, T. Winder, and W. C. Fenton.

LEGAL.

Mr William Hewson Lees [A.] writes:—In the JOURNAL for May 20 there is a note of a case under "Legal"—*Regina v. The London County Council*—in which it is incorrectly stated that the land in Deptford was unbuilt on, and that the surveyor in his certificate treated the enclosing fence as a structure. Permit me to point out that the land in question was a large rambling piece of ground with several buildings and structures thereon, and was bounded on the side in dispute by a wooden fence. A certificate was applied for under sect. 13 (5) of the Building Act, and this was given by me, the land being occupied by buildings, and the line of fence was marked by dimensions taken from the opposite side of the street.

